



RB 112.25



Library  
of the  
University of Toronto

HANDBOUND  
AT THE




UNIVERSITY OF  
TORONTO PRESS









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto





9042

# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No.:

8

DATE:

MAY 6, 1964.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865

364-7383









ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Wednesday, May 6th,  
1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.,  
et seq.

\* \* \* \* \*

PRESENT:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
F. H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant

\* \* \* \* \*







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE  
TOWN OF WESTON

770 - 787

LAKESHORE DISTRICT BOARD OF  
EDUCATION

788 - 793

THE ONTARIO TEACHERS' FEDERATION

794 - 813

LEASIDE PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

814 - 817

\* \* \* \* \*







1 ---UPON COMMENCING AT 10:00 A.M.:

2  
3 SUBMISSION BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
4 OF THE TOWN OF WESTON

5  
6 APPEARANCES:

7 MR. EDWIN F. AULT - Chairman of the Board  
8 MR. C.R. MARCHANT - Business Administrator  
9 & Secretary-Treasurer  
10 MR. H.D. HIGGINS - Board Member and Metro  
11 School Board  
12 Representative

13 THE COMMISSIONER: The Board of Education  
14 for the Town of Weston. Mr. Ault, is it?

15 MR. AULT: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.

16 I would like to say, sir, that it is a  
17 privilege to appear here before you. I have with me  
18 our Business Administrator and Secretary-Treasurer, Mr.  
19 C.R. Marchant, who has had many years of experience on  
20 the Weston Board initially as a Trustee and for many  
21 years as our Business Administrator. He is very, very  
22 familiar with education in Weston and I am sure that if  
23 you have questions along this line he will be able to  
24 provide you with the answers. Myself, I was on the  
25 Municipal Council of Weston before being on the School  
26 Board so that my knowledge is perhaps not as great on  
27 educational matters as Mr. Marchant's.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You were promoted?

29 MR. AULT: Yes, that is correct. Also we  
30







1 have with us Mr. Higgins, who is not unfortunately  
2 listed as a speaker, but he is our representative on  
3 the Metro Board and a member of our Board.

4 The position of the Weston Board, Mr.  
5 Commissioner, is that the Metropolitan School Board as  
6 it is established functions very successfully and the  
7 existing metropolitan concept of a federated basis will  
8 meet the challenges of our time. We feel that the  
9 principle of full utilization of existing facilities is  
10 a sound one with respect to students attending the  
11 schools nearest their homes. This means that you do  
12 not have partially filled schools, as would be the case  
13 in our particular system if we were just restricted to  
14 schools providing education for those in the immediate  
15 vicinity.

16 The secondary school in Weston has a history  
17 and tradition of over one hundred years' service to the  
18 Weston area and since 1922 has operated as a composite  
19 school which, under the new re-organized plan for  
20 secondary education with the three streams of edu-  
21 cation being equal and inter-changeable, is an ideal  
22 school organization for emphasizing and implementing  
23 this inter-changeability.

24 This composite school is a popular type of  
25 school in the Township of North York. I believe that  
26 the majority of their secondary schools are this type,  
27 the same as the Weston School, which was probably the  
28 first one in existence in this area.

29 The Weston Board has innovated the idea of  
30 guest members who are non-voting. We have one from each





1 of the municipalities of North York and Etobicoke who  
2 have been appointed with the approval of their res-  
3 pective boards. This idea of having the guest members  
4 on the Board answers the objections of the parents of  
5 non-resident students that they lack representation on  
6 our Board.

7 The experience with these members has been  
8 that they show very great interest in the work of our  
9 Board. In reality the power of voting is of secondary  
10 importance since in the thousand or more questions that  
11 have come to a vote since I have been on the Board  
12 there have only been one or two carried by a one-vote  
13 majority. So I do think being present and participating  
14 in the discussion of the work is the key.

15 As far as special services are concerned,  
16 in our system we operate an auxiliary class for slow-  
17 learning junior elementary students to provide them  
18 with a special education. We also have an occupation-  
19 al course in our secondary school for the ones who can-  
20 not handle the regular course.

21 This leaves only a few Weston students who  
22 are not taken care of by our own system. Because of  
23 their specialized educational requirements they are  
24 transported to the specialized Metro-financed schools  
25 which must look to the entire area for a capacity at-  
26 tendance because of the small numbers involved.

27 Probably there is no reason why the Metro  
28 Board should not be authorized to administer these  
29 special schools. It is my understanding at present  
30 that because they are located mainly in the City of







1 Toronto they fall under the jurisdiction of the Toronto  
2 Board. I do not think it is a matter of importance  
3 just which Board administers them, but certainly as  
4 far as we are concerned we have no objection whether  
5 it is Metro or Toronto. The requirement for these  
6 special services is not that great that they should be  
7 set up everywhere is our contention, sir.

8 The Metro Advisory Committee, which com-  
9 prises the Area Boards' officials, we feel has proved  
10 to be a most valuable tool of knowledge and experience,  
11 and this would be impossible to achieve under one  
12 system. I think in any question many heads are better  
13 than one, and if everybody was on one Board then the  
14 person at the top would be making all the decisions  
15 and those in inferior positions would have the usual  
16 inhibiting effect -- their position would have this  
17 effect on what they might contribute.

18 The Weston system has achieved a high-  
19 quality and standard of education. This is the primary  
20 concern of any Board whether it is large or small. We  
21 are definitely very proud of what has been achieved in  
22 Weston.

23 There are many intangible factors involved  
24 in this. We consider the staff of experienced teachers  
25 who are employed in our system -- and many of these  
26 have moved to advanced positions in the education field,  
27 and I think, Mr. Commissioner, there will be one of  
28 these before you later on this morning with one of the  
29 other Boards -- our elementary staff is much superior  
30 to the average staffs in the large systems. We have







1     been informed by officials not in our system that if  
2     Weston was to be absorbed many of these good teachers  
3     we have would be transferred to strengthen the staffs  
4     of other schools.

5             Weston wants and can get good teachers who  
6     state a preference for working in the Weston system,  
7     because there is freedom for individual initiative and  
8     ready recognition of achievement and they do not have  
9     the burden of red tape and split responsibility to  
10    principal and supervisory staff. In our system the  
11    principal is the one that has the sole responsibility  
12    for the performance of the schools. This is as it  
13    should be.

14            We contend that a good inspection service  
15    is not an acceptable substitute for good teachers but  
16    would concede that it is necessary if you are not fortu-  
17    nate enough in getting the top quality staff.

18            With respect to the education leadership  
19    which has been given by the Weston system over the  
20    years, we were the first school in the Metro area to  
21    initiate the tri-level system with the senior public  
22    school basis and this has been adopted by Toronto and  
23    some of the other area Boards subsequently.

24            We have the first registered nursing  
25    assistants' course in Metro. The proximity of a pro-  
26    gressive hospital to our school (it is only about  
27    three blocks away, and it is one of the few hospitals  
28    in Ontario that operates in the black) and a progres-  
29    sive school system naturally resulted in the first  
30    Metro registered nursing assistants' course, and this







1 takes in a large surrounding area. We are pleased to  
2 provide this training.

3 The driver training programme we have is  
4 the only one in the Metro area giving the students  
5 professional instruction in driving, which is most  
6 important these days with the number of cars and young  
7 people driving. This has been made possible by the  
8 generosity of a local community-minded Ford dealer  
9 who provides without charge a new car every year or so.  
10 This type of community interest is not found in the  
11 large areas.

12 Also not only do we provide leadership;  
13 we also stay abreast in education in Weston. We have  
14 the only elementary oral French programme in the Metro  
15 area which covers all of Grades IV to VIII commencing  
16 in September, 1964.

17 We employ specialists to provide the neces-  
18 sary help for students with defective speech. There  
19 is a resultant saving in overhead -- we are not having  
20 to have staff for this. Also if necessary it is a  
21 simple expediency to sever a relationship with in-  
22 structors who do not prove to be satisfactory.

23 The Weston Teaching Aids programme is one  
24 of the outstanding ones in this country perhaps. The  
25 brief explains the development of it and we certainly  
26 feel it is the best, although it was not referred to  
27 in the Metro brief. On a per teacher basis I would  
28 venture to say we are better equipped than any of the  
29 other areas. We have had a teacher from each of the  
30 schools in our system take a special weeks' training







1 course in the States on the use of new equipment in  
2 this field. This of course provides leadership and  
3 interest for the other members of our staff.

4 We have a recognized expert in audio-visio  
5 working with our teachers and outstanding results have  
6 been achieved this year using overhead projection equip-  
7 ment in our kindergarten and elementary schools.

8 The economy of operation is a most im-  
9 portant matter for consideration by the public. The  
10 cost of education and value for the educational tax  
11 dollar must be a matter of prime importance in the  
12 operation of any school board be it large or small.  
13 The Weston taxpayers have been fortunate in obtaining  
14 first-rate educational facilities and instruction at a  
15 reasonable cost.

16 All our schools have been constructed with-  
17 in the Provincial grant structure giving us modern  
18 functional schools. They are not more luxurious than  
19 the students' homes but they do give the children a  
20 top quality education.

21 Our costs of education as shown in the  
22 tables and the other tables that have been prepared  
23 compare very favourably with those of our neighbours  
24 and are much lower than Toronto's costs -- you might  
25 say the costs of the largest existing metro borough  
26 today. Our costs reveal a substantial saving to the  
27 taxpayers of the neighbouring municipalities to which  
28 we sell education.

29 The Weston Board disputes the Metro brief  
30 claim that it is uneconomical to operate a small system.







1 If Weston was a member of a large system such as  
2 Toronto we would be paying about 9 1/2 mills more on  
3 our annual tax bill this year.

4 The Weston Board resents and objects to  
5 the implication contained in the Metro brief that lower  
6 pupil costs means a second-rate education.

7 I would like to quote to you, Mr. Commissioner,  
8 from an article appearing in The Globe & Mail on  
9 Tuesday, December 18th under the World of Learning  
10 column by J. Bascom St. John, who I think is well  
11 known as a writer on educational matters. He said:  
12 "For one thing no rule of thumb comparison such as  
13 cost per pupil means anything in terms of educational  
14 quality. You could have a perfect jewel of a teacher  
15 in a rural school where the cost per pupil was low and  
16 a sloppy inefficiency in an over-large system where the  
17 cost was very high. New York City for instance is re-  
18 garded as having one of the worst school systems in  
19 the United States, but it is by no means the cheapest."

20 I think there is food for thought in  
21 those comments, Mr. Commissioner, when one considers  
22 the future of Metro Toronto. We feel teachers are the  
23 heart and soul of education -- it is not plush admini-  
24 strative offices and limousine services -- and three-  
25 quarters of the Weston education money, as you will  
26 note from our brief, is spent on the teachers.

27 With respect to the education future in  
28 Metro Toronto the Weston Board supports the existing  
29 powers of the Metropolitan School Board but suggests  
30 certain revisions are warranted to achieve the full





1 intent of the original legislation. These corrective  
2 measures would bring up to date and strengthen the  
3 fine "Metro" concept without disrupting the many ad-  
4 vantages now enjoyed by all municipalities.

5 It is our opinion that the Metropolitan  
6 School Board should have a system of weighted voting  
7 by municipalities. It might be considered unfair that  
8 one Board which has about 33 percent of the population  
9 in the area has 50 percent of the seats on the Metro  
10 Board.

11 The Metro Board should have power to  
12 control and provide all the funds spent on the con-  
13 struction of new buildings and additions as well as  
14 the replacement or major renovations of old buildings  
15 so as to equalize educational facilities. This would  
16 prevent over-spending by some boards so that schools  
17 in some areas do not become palaces as compared to  
18 schools in other areas.

19 The Metro Board should establish a  
20 common teacher salary schedule for all area boards.  
21 We have very regretfully adopted this position, Mr.  
22 Commissioner, since it appears impossible for the area  
23 boards to voluntarily agree on a uniform salary  
24 schedule and this is obviously used by the teachers  
25 to their advantage in salary negotiations.

26 I know, Mr. Commissioner, that you are  
27 very familiar with this business of arbitration and I  
28 am certain you are also familiar with the facts that  
29 have been brought home to me in my past experience  
30 with it -- that the greatest fights occur at the







1 employers' meetings rather than when the employer meets  
2 the employees. I think this is common in our society,  
3 that employers just do not get along with each other  
4 as they will with their employees. So there just does  
5 not seem to be any other answer to this point.

6 Also it is our opinion that the Metro  
7 Board should co-ordinate and direct adult education in-  
8 cluding government re-training and post grade XIII  
9 courses -- also perhaps certain special educational  
10 services which are now conducted on a Metro-wide area  
11 because of the limited number of students that require  
12 this type of education, and also the very special type  
13 of facilities which are required.

14 In conclusion, Mr. Commissioner, I would  
15 like to say that the Weston Board is quite satisfied  
16 to continue administering education in the Town of  
17 Weston on the current basis so that our students may  
18 continue to enjoy the many benefits and advantages of  
19 a small system, which are so well described in the Metro  
20 brief. I believe it is on page 51, if you have a  
21 printed copy, where it says:

22 "School Boards in small districts  
23 tend to attach great significance to the  
24 personal needs of staff members. The re-  
25 lationship between teachers on the one hand  
26 and trustees and officials on the other is  
27 more likely to be on a warm, personal, often  
28 first-name basis. This continuing concern for  
29 staff members as individuals generates a  
30 feeling of security which in turn reacts







1 favourably on teacher performance. It is a  
2 climate conducive to individual initiative and  
3 experimentation. Moreover this sense of con-  
4 cern for the individual is contagious and is  
5 passed on by the teachers to the pupils. All  
6 in all it is a climate which breeds strong  
7 loyalties and makes for maximum effort and  
8 consistent achievement.

9 Because education is a public ser-  
10 vice the relationship between Boards and the  
11 general public is important. In small areas  
12 it seems possible to maintain closer links  
13 with parents and ratepayers.

14 Finally, in a small operation the  
15 Trustees' responsibility is set on a more  
16 comprehensible and manageable level. It seems  
17 easier to make policy for a few schools than  
18 for many schools. In so doing, Trustees are  
19 making decisions relative to situations with  
20 which they are closely familiar."

21 Furthermore, the importance of personal  
22 relationships in education cannot be overstressed since  
23 the objective is to mold young lives and teachers can-  
24 not give their full attention to this vital work when  
25 they are overwhelmed by red tape and supervising  
26 checks and investigations which must be conducted in  
27 any large organization if it is to function properly.

28 Any business or activity must have a  
29 sound economic base to be successful. Centralization  
30 is not the answer since many large firms are now





1 de-centralizing. It would be tragic to sacrifice a  
2 good education system operating on an efficient econo-  
3 mic basis, such as the Weston one, to the gods of amalga-  
4 mation or new boroughs now being promoted in this City  
5 by, we venture to state, only the editors of the three  
6 daily newspapers and a few politicians in Toronto who  
7 are probably most interested in perpetuating the past  
8 prominence of the City of Toronto.

9 Also, Mr. Commissioner, on this parti-  
10 cular subject of large areas I think we should direct  
11 our attention to the complication of the large ex-  
12 pense involved in elections. This would mean, I would  
13 submit, political parties being involved and when you  
14 have a subject such as education I would hate the  
15 students to be the pawn in the power play between one  
16 political party in power in charge of education and an-  
17 other one in the government. I do not think the in-  
18 terest of the students would be best served if such a  
19 situation were to develop. We cannot get away from  
20 these power plays that do take place.

21 The Weston Board would hate to see our  
22 system, which has been developed by the labours of so  
23 many dedicated citizens of our community, deteriorate  
24 into the over-looked northwest corner of York Township  
25 or the over-looked southwest corner of North York  
26 Township. We are definitely opposed to any such steps  
27 since many boroughs both large and small make up other  
28 metropolitan areas such as the City of London in  
29 England. It is contrary to the democratic process and  
30 principles to pick on the smallest because the







1 objections will not receive too much notice.

2 The Weston Board is willing to continue  
3 its policy of co-operation with its neighbours and if  
4 necessary is prepared to enlarge its jurisdictional  
5 area and provide the benefits of our system to the en-  
6 larged area.

7 The Weston Board is confident that with  
8 a few minor adjustments the Metropolitan system will  
9 continue to work well on its present basis and prove  
10 itself to be the best solution for the problems which  
11 were so admirably dealt with by Mr. Lorne Cumming some  
12 ten years ago.

13 I sincerely trust that this Commission  
14 will avail itself of the invitation extended in our  
15 brief to visit our system. We are certain it will  
16 prove most helpful and enlightening to you. Our Mr.  
17 Marchant will gladly make the arrangements to suit  
18 your convenience.

19 Thank you.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you think, Mr.  
21 Ault, that it would be in the best interests of edu-  
22 cation of the children of this area if all the school  
23 boards were reduced to about the size of the School  
24 Board of Weston?

25 MR. AULT: I would not make that state-  
26 ment, Mr. Commissioner, because I think there is a lot  
27 of history and tradition that is involved in each of  
28 the boards. They have molded their function to serve  
29 their existing area and I think that when you have an  
30 administrative unit set up that works well, then you do







1 not tamper with that one. As Mr. Gardiner has said on  
2 many occasions, and I heard him, you do not throw a  
3 monkey wrench in a well-oiled machine. I would submit  
4 that is the type of machine we have in Weston. I do  
5 not think that you can generalize and say this is the  
6 pattern; it will work for everything.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Having regard to the  
8 total population of Weston and the school enrolment,  
9 both of which are small, do you feel that you really  
10 have all the resources to meet the requirements of a  
11 modern school system?

12 MR. AULT: On the basis of the existing  
13 one -- the way Metropolitan Toronto education functions  
14 at the present time, Mr. Commissioner, we are able to  
15 do this quite satisfactorily, I would submit.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: What would happen to  
17 the system that you have established and of which you  
18 are proud -- and I can well understand that -- if  
19 Weston were annexed, say, to York?

20 MR. AULT: This is exactly what we fear.  
21 Nobody knows; but we do not want to see it. We would  
22 rather keep our system and apply it to a larger area  
23 than lose it.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: It would not make  
25 any difference to you whether it is York Township or  
26 North York. You feel you would lose the benefits of  
27 what you have now?

28 MR. AULT: Most definitely, Mr.  
29 Commissioner.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you feel you offer





1 greater advantages to the children than are offered in  
2 either of those municipalities?

3 MR. AULT: Certainly, Mr. Commissioner,  
4 we do. We feel that children attending our schools re-  
5 ceive one of the best educations available, particularly  
6 when one takes into account the economic factors in-  
7 volved.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You said that you  
9 established in Weston the tri-level system, senior  
10 public schools being the second level.

11 MR. AULT: That is the tri; that is the  
12 third level. We started out with elementary and  
13 secondary and then introduced senior public. We were  
14 the first municipality in the Metropolitan area to  
15 introduce a third level.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but North York,  
17 I was told yesterday, also has a tri-level system.

18 MR. AULT: Yes.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: They have junior high  
20 instead of senior public?

21 MR. AULT: I believe that most of the  
22 boards in the metro area, Mr. Commissioner, now have a  
23 tri-level which varies from the North York system of a  
24 junior high to the other system which Weston has and  
25 also the City of Toronto has of a senior public. These  
26 are the two variations of the tri-level now in effect.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: You feel that amalga-  
28 mation with North York (I just cite that as an example)  
29 would mean a change which would operate to the detriment  
30 of what your children are receiving now?







1 MR. AULT: Yes, Mr. Commissioner, that  
2 is our contention, most definitely. We would be most  
3 unhappy to see that development losing the entity of  
4 our system.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: My question is, would  
6 you be unhappy because of sentiment, the loss of id-  
7 entity of your system, or would you be unhappy because  
8 you feel it would mean a loss to the educational faci-  
9 lities offered to the children of Weston?

10 MR. AULT: I think there would be a  
11 definite loss to the educational facilities and the  
12 education received by the students attending the Weston  
13 schools if the Weston system was to be done away with  
14 and another one was to be introduced.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I can see that if the  
16 suggestion was amalgamation with an area where there  
17 was definitely an inferior system of schooling.

18 MR. AULT: It is our contention, Mr.  
19 Commissioner, that our system basically is a superior  
20 one. I am not just saying this. We have had visitors  
21 from the North York staff -- their employees, not their  
22 board members, mind you. It is practically unanimous  
23 -- and Mr. Marchant can confirm this -- that they are  
24 very, very impressed with what they see in Weston and  
25 they wish they had it in North York.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: How about York  
27 Township?

28 MR. AULT: I would say that the same  
29 would apply to York Township. We do not have a close  
30 connection with York Township other than that we have







1 used their vocational school for our students that  
2 could not attend secondary school or finish elementary.  
3 To my knowledge that is the only connection that we  
4 have with York Township, so our association, of course,  
5 is not as close. We take students from a North York  
6 Junior Public School into our Senior Public School.  
7 We have done this for many years. We also provide  
8 secondary education; so we are very familiar with North  
9 York and also the Etobicoke situation.

10 As I pointed out in the brief we have  
11 a member resident from each of those municipalities as  
12 a member of our board.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: From your standpoint  
14 you have said that amalgamation with either North York  
15 or York would not be an improvement in any event.  
16 Would it be even worse from your standpoint if there  
17 were an amalgamated board covering the whole area?

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 -  
29  
30





je 1 MR. AULT: Mr. Commissioner, I would say  
2 our brief is on the basis that the larger the area the  
3 worse it gets, so the answer to your question would be  
4 yes.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

6 MR. AULT: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner,  
7 for the hearing.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Lakeshore Board of  
9 Education, Mr. Morrison.

10 MR. FARROW: Farrow, sir. He was chair-  
11 man of the board last year.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I see the brief was  
13 submitted to me on December 16.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30







1 SUBMISSION OF THE LAKESHORE DISTRICT  
2  
3 BOARD OF EDUCATION

4 APPEARANCES:

5 MR. W.C. FARROW - Chairman  
6 MR. G. GILLESPIE - Business Director  
7 & Superintendent of  
8 Elementary Education

9 -----

10 MR. FARROW: Mr. Commissioner, my name  
11 is Farrow. In my connection with the Lakeshore Board  
12 I have been asked to represent the Board in the sub-  
13 mission of their brief. I am accompanied by Mr. Gillespie,  
14 our Business Director and Superintendent of Elementary  
15 Education.

16 In commenting on our brief I would like  
17 to say that maybe what it does not say is as important  
18 as what it does say. We did not engage outside help.  
19 We are trying to express the opinion of the board  
20 members. We have not submitted charts or supporting  
21 information.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I have lots of those.

23 MR. FARROW: Exactly. We have not sub-  
24 mitted charts or supporting information on the ground  
25 that you would have plenty of that information and it  
26 would only clutter up the files to have us submit more.  
27 We did feel it was important for us to present our view  
28 to you, however, so that you would understand how our  
29 minds are working.  
30







1 It is our feeling that the metropolitan  
2 school system has had many successes. True, it is not  
3 a perfect system. Possibly there is no perfect system,  
4 but this system has, in our minds, many advantages, and  
5 we are supporting the continuance of a metropolitan  
6 system with possibly some amendments.

7 Mr. Commissioner, I would like to draw  
8 to your attention that we already have a form of amal-  
9 gamation in our own area in that New Toronto, Mimico  
10 and Long Branch amalgamated into one area board back in  
11 the early '50s.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: And it has worked.

13 MR. FARROW: It has worked very nicely.  
14 We are getting along well together, and in our brief we  
15 outline the number of schools which we have, the number  
16 of teachers and pupils and so on. We would be happy to  
17 answer any questions that you might have or if you would  
18 care to come and see our system we would be very de-  
19 lighted to have you do so.

20 The situation has changed in regard to  
21 one matter which is mentioned in our brief, and that is  
22 in connection with the 100 percent metro support of  
23 capital expenditures, so that it really has no validity  
24 any more. It is still in there, and it is still our op-  
25 inion regardless of the fact it has now been adopted.  
26 I don't know that there is anything else to say, Mr.  
27 Commissioner, except to say once again it was our in-  
28 tention to keep our submission as short as possible in  
29 the hope that it might commend it to your attention.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: I am afraid I have to





1 read them whether they are long or short. You mentioned  
2 the interesting fact that three Lakeshore municipalities  
3 have already amalgamated their school systems.

4 MR. FARROW: Right.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: And that that has  
6 functioned well. Why would you object to further  
7 amalgamation?

8 MR. FARROW: We feel there is an ad-  
9 vantage in having the elected representatives close to  
10 the operation. In other words, we fear that if control  
11 is set at a distance from us -- we don't know how far  
12 -- then the local people will lose their court of  
13 appeal. In other words, it will have to go through so  
14 many hands to reach the decision-making body  
15 that this would be a step backward.

16 Another thing we fear is if a larger  
17 area is established, then the elected representatives'  
18 power will diminish and the power of the bureaucrat,  
19 of the administrator, will increase. I do not want  
20 you to take from that that we are opposed to admini-  
21 strative power, but we feel there is a balance here  
22 that ought to be respected, and this balance might  
23 change in a degree that we would rather not see happen.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I presume that ap-  
25 plies to the suggestion of the centralization of ed-  
26 ucation system under one board for the whole area?

27 MR. FARROW: Yes. We would not like to  
28 see that occur.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Would it also apply  
30 to, let us say, amalgamation of your board with the







1 Etobicoke Board?

2 MR. FARROW: Yes. We would rather not  
3 see that happen. In our case we have a high industrial  
4 assessment, and we fear that if a borough system occurs  
5 or total amalgamation, that costs of education are going  
6 to rise. They are going to spend more money. I think  
7 this is something which is difficult to prove, but it  
8 is our opinion that they will rise because the talk  
9 now is that the levels are going to be raised, and if  
10 this level is raised, you will spend more money, so you  
11 get the result in the Lakeshore of us having to live  
12 with our industries where we have that assessment, and  
13 that assessment is going to be used by other areas to  
14 support their school systems.

15 We feel while we are willing to shoulder  
16 our share of the metropolitan costs under the present  
17 system, that if a borough system or amalgamated system  
18 came about, we would be shouldering a larger share of  
19 those costs and still have the disadvantage of living  
20 next door to the industry. We feel living next door to  
21 the industry should bring us some benefits.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You want compensation  
23 for living next to industry?

24 MR. FARROW: Yes. This is in a degree  
25 true. It is more pleasant to live in a nice residential  
26 area where there is no industry. At least I would as-  
27 sume this is true.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Because if you have  
29 a relatively high assessment and others are not so  
30 favoured, the purpose of the establishment of Metro was





1 to share.

2 MR. FARROW: Well, we feel we are doing  
3 that now in the Metro system.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: You just don't want  
5 to share too much?

6 MR. FARROW: We don't want the whole  
7 apple to be taken.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you satisfied  
9 with the school system that your board operates; that  
10 it provides what is needed today?

11 MR. FARROW: Yes. I would say we have  
12 a progressive board. We are now preparing to have  
13 senior public schools. We are not operating them at  
14 the moment, but we will be operating one in September  
15 and the others will follow as soon as we can make pro-  
16 vision for them. I feel that our system is large en-  
17 ough to offer all of the advantages that are obtainable.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: You recommend that  
19 the Metropolitan School Board should be given power to  
20 negotiate uniform salary schedules for teachers?

21 MR. FARROW: Yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you lost teachers  
23 because of differentials in salary bases today, or  
24 salary schedules?

25 MR. FARROW: I would say this is true,  
26 but I think that a more important aspect of the situ-  
27 ation is the competition amongst the employers that  
28 brings about an unsatisfactory situation. We have lost  
29 some teachers because of this, yes, because they could  
30







1 get better offers elsewhere. This is true.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you feel if the  
3 offers were the same throughout the area that you would  
4 get all the teachers you want for the Lakeshore?

5 MR. FARROW: No, I would not take that  
6 position at all because we all know that the supply of  
7 secondary school teachers -- this has to do with  
8 secondary school teachers.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is where  
10 the scarcity is.

11 MR. FARROW: This would not provide all  
12 the teachers, but on the other hand, raising the  
13 schedule does not provide more teachers either. That  
14 is, right away. It might. Some people take the stand  
15 it will in the long view, but in the short view it  
16 does not matter what the schedule is; it won't provide  
17 more graduates from the college of education. There-  
18 fore, our view is it would stabilize the situation if  
19 a uniform scale could be adopted for metro. It would  
20 stabilize the situation and we submit this has some  
21 advantage.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I think that covers  
23 about all I wanted to ask about. Thank you.

24 Ontario Teachers' Federation.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF THE ONTARIO TEACHERS' FEDERATION

APPEARANCES:

MR. P. H. O'LEARY - Third Vice-President  
MISS MARION EVANS, East York  
MR. DUNCAN GREEN, Toronto  
MR. A. ROBB, Toronto  
MISS ELEANOR STEWART, North York  
MR. JOHN MC NEIL, North York  
MISS DOROTHY MARTIN, Federation of Women Teachers  
MISS ROSEMARIE LUXFORD, Assistant Secretary  
MR. WINSTON DAVIES, Ontario Public School Men  
Teachers  
DR. S.G.B. ROBINSON, Ontario Secondary School  
MISS NORA HODGINS, Secretary, Provincial Office  
MR. MYUNG SOO LIM, Korean Teachers' Federation

----

MR. O'LEARY: Mr. Commissioner, we have  
a very large delegation here. Is it in order to intro-  
duce the group?

THE COMMISSIONER: Pardon?

MR. O'LEARY: Is it in order to intro-  
duce the group?

THE COMMISSIONER: I leave it entirely  
to you.

MR. O'LEARY: I will do it briefly.  
We have amongst our delegation a few of the committee  
who have spent some time on studying this matter and  
have prepared our brief. We have Miss Marion Evans







1 from East York, Mr. Duncan Green from Toronto, Mr. A.  
2 Robb, from Toronto, Miss Eleanor Stewart from North  
3 York, Mr. John McNeil, from North York, and the other  
4 members are members of the Ontario Teachers' Federation  
5 Executive: Miss Dorothy Martin, from the Federation of  
6 Women Teachers, Miss Rosemarie Luxford who is assist-  
7 ant secretary in our office, Mr. Winston Davies from  
8 the Ontario Public School Men Teachers, and Dr.  
9 Steve Robinson from the Ontario Secondary Schools,  
10 Miss Nora Hodgins, Secretary, from the Ontario Teachers'  
11 Federation Provincial Office; and might I introduce a  
12 guest of ours, Mr. Myung Soo Lim from South Korea who  
13 is visiting us on an educational visit. He is from  
14 the Korean Federation of Teachers Association.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think it is  
16 safe to let him hear some of the controversies that go  
17 on?

18 MR. O'LEARY: We have asked Miss Evans  
19 to present our brief to you.

20 MISS EVANS: Mr. Goldenberg, The Ontario  
21 Teachers' Federation has long been aware of the impli-  
22 cation of a solidification of educational authority  
23 within the bounds of Metropolitan Toronto. The catch  
24 phrases of "equalization of educational opportunity"  
25 and "increased efficiency of expenditure and operation"  
26 are designed to ring most appealingly in the ears of  
27 all tax-conscious rate-payers. To arrive at some esti-  
28 mation of the validity of these slogans has been the  
29 function of this particular committee of the Ontario  
30





1 Teachers' Federation.

2 Faced with numerous proposals for re-  
3 organization of the government of Metropolitan Toronto,  
4 we approached the problem of the effects of such on the  
5 future of education in Metro as free from pre-conceived  
6 notion as possible. Our concern has always been to ar-  
7 rive at a solution to the question "What is best for  
8 education?" In particular, what is best for the pupils  
9 we teach? What is best for the communities in which  
10 we live and work, and for the teachers who have the most  
11 direct responsibility for the effectiveness of the  
12 learning process?

13 With striking clarity it was forced on our  
14 attention that the impetus for amalgamation or an-  
15 nexation of school boards came not from groups of  
16 teachers finding the diversity of educational philo-  
17 sophy and organization among the several areas an in-  
18 tolerable burden to effective teaching, nor from or-  
19 ganizations of parents expressing a sweeping dissatis-  
20 faction with the quality of teaching in any of the  
21 local communities. No, the urgency for the elimination  
22 or submergency of highly successful and smoothly  
23 functioning administration units has arisen from neither  
24 of these groups so immediately concerned with education.

25 A second realization was that, to the  
26 best of our knowledge, never has been voiced wide-  
27 spread criticism of the quality of education, nor of the  
28 equality of educational opportunity within this area.

29 The entire question, as it concerns  
30







1 education has been with a so-called inequality of edu-  
2 cational spending. A fallacious equation has been  
3 formed with the two factors being the number of dollars  
4 spent per pupil per year balanced by the blanket phrase  
5 "educational opportunity".

6 As educators we must disagree that the best  
7 criterion of educational quality is the number of dollars  
8 spent. We view with nothing save alarm the all-too-  
9 prevalent assumption that equal opportunity in education  
10 is necessarily ensured by identical school costs among  
11 adjacent units of school administration.

12 Education has never been measured alone  
13 by dollars and cents. It has always been more than  
14 buildings and physical facilities. Education is basical-  
15 ly philosophical, rather than physical; subjective, rather  
16 than objective; personal, rather than impersonal. The  
17 end result must always be the individual, never a  
18 product.

19 Any conjecture as to the future of edu-  
20 cation under an amalgamation of the several school  
21 boards into the large Super-board must be governed by  
22 the example of amalgamation of other correspondingly  
23 large education units. To make comparison one must  
24 turn to the most illuminating histories of New York  
25 City and London. Both have long passed the point of  
26 maximum efficiency, as they are presently constituted.  
27 The continual soul-searching and pleas for increased  
28 community interest and participation in school affairs  
29 in the New York City area as reported in its daily press  
30





1 and periodic literature are indicative of the need,  
2 not for increased centralization and direction, but  
3 rather for local initiative and increased responsibility  
4 at the community level. New York City and London have  
5 experienced that with which we in the Toronto area  
6 are faced, education by written report, rather than  
7 from personal knowledge. A similar situation confronts  
8 Chicago, Dade County, Florida and other urban areas.

9           The general trend today is to diversify,  
10 rather than to centralize. A recognition of values of  
11 initiative and personal responsibility is evidenced by  
12 the action of large corporations. General Motors and  
13 General Electric are two examples where decentrali-  
14 zation has taken place within these companies to en-  
15 sure more efficient and economical operation by return-  
16 ing much of the decision-making in so many areas of  
17 activity to the local plant level. In a matter such as  
18 stock-ordering a local unit can, with its knowledge of  
19 the local scene, reap the benefits of competitive  
20 bidding.

21           While we have stated that education is  
22 not a mechanical process, nor an assembly line, yet the  
23 previous statement is yet applicable to education.  
24 Diversity in philosophy and method can only create an  
25 atmosphere where the current practice is accepted as  
26 not inevitably the best. The many examples of experi-  
27 mentation and individual learning situations inaugurated  
28 to meet the requirements of groups of youngsters of  
29 highly specialized abilities in local communities can  
30







1 lead only to an ever-expanding body of educational  
2 theory, knowledge and practice.

3 As we have attempted to point out in the  
4 brief, stagnation of idea, an acceptance of the more  
5 easily attained, rather than the more difficult but  
6 educationally excellent, the average rather than the  
7 supreme, a lock-step rather than creative freedom and  
8 initiative -- these will toll the death-knell of  
9 education.

10 We, as teachers, can only be wary, in-  
11 deed apprehensive of proposals to curtail the breadth  
12 of education available now within the framework of  
13 educational organization of Metropolitan Toronto.

14 How better can education be advanced  
15 than by local interest on the broadest possible level?  
16 How could a group of elected or appointed trustees of an  
17 amalgamated Metropolitan Toronto School Board of even  
18 22 members, as has been suggested, be truly and effect-  
19 ively a body representative of local needs and wishes?  
20 We are concerned that in such an organization, repre-  
21 sentation by population would be less than that  
22 achieved by the Federal ratio of 1 member to 70,000  
23 persons, the Provincial scale of 1:50,000, and indeed,  
24 by any of local school boards in the Toronto area.  
25 Government would be lessened in representative voice  
26 and in authority as it became ever more remote from  
27 those it attempted to serve. These questions are a  
28 key to the inadvisability of creating such a large  
29 unit of educational administration that a pyramidal  
30





1 hierarchy of authority would be necessitated.

2 Our recommendations as to the optimum  
3 organization of educational facilities within  
4 Metropolitan Toronto are stated in our brief. Our con-  
5 viction is that we must continue to accentuate the ex-  
6 cellence of education, not the economy; the accomplish-  
7 ments of individual school boards, not the accounting;  
8 the merits of creativity and experimentation, not the  
9 mill-rate.

10 We must keep as our motto, the quality  
11 of equality. We would be happy to answer any questions.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you believe there  
13 is equality of educational opportunity under the present  
14 system in Metropolitan Toronto with eleven boards of  
15 varying size?

16 MISS EVANS: I personally do. My com-  
17 mittee is far-flung.

18 MR. GREEN: Has any board suggested to  
19 you, sir, that it is unhappy with its present  
20 arrangement?

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You would be quite  
22 surprised if any board came before me and said "We  
23 can't provide equal educational opportunities with  
24 others." I am asking you as teachers whether with the  
25 present set-up where you have enrolments varying from  
26 -- I am giving figures for elementary schools -- en-  
27 rolments varying from 800 to 72,000, whether you feel  
28 that there is equality of educational opportunity under  
29 all of these boards.  
30







1 MR. ROBB: I would feel that there is  
2 not the same opportunity. This is what we are striving  
3 to point out. As we say in our brief, the equality is  
4 not money spent. There are different opportunities --

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not talking in  
6 terms of money. I know the cost per pupil varies.

7 MR. ROBB: There are different opportunities  
8 provided in different areas where there is a difference  
9 of philosophy. Even in the very theoretical realm of  
10 philosophy there are many different views. This applies  
11 to education.

12 We feel this should continue to apply to  
13 education. We do not want one system where all children  
14 are offered one type of opportunity, even three-level  
15 types. We feel each area is providing what it feels is  
16 best for its children in its area.

17 As large as this area is, there are  
18 many differing localities, sentiments and needs, and  
19 the area provides for the needs within its own area.  
20 Therefore we do not feel we can equate what is equal.  
21 It has to vary according to the needs.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say that  
23 the needs vary greatly within this one area?

24 MR. ROBB: Yes, I would, sir, and with  
25 this difference in philosophy, there are different ways  
26 of attacking the same needs; whereas with one board  
27 you would have one method of attacking a problem with-  
28 in the area, and with different boards they can adopt  
29 different means.  
30





1                   As long as they are following sound princi-  
2 ples of education, which I would say all boards are  
3 doing, then it is worthwhile to have a difference so  
4 that they can do it to suit what they feel is right.

5                   THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say that  
6 there are eleven different philosophies of education in  
7 Metropolitan Toronto?

8                   MR. ROBB: I would say there are more  
9 than that, sir.

10                  THE COMMISSIONER: I would think so.

11                  MR. ROBB: I would submit there are  
12 many, many more.

13                  THE COMMISSIONER: Why not break up the  
14 existing boards and have twenty-five boards or something  
15 like that?

16                  MR. ROBB: If we could, sir, put edu-  
17 cational philosophy into twenty-five compartments, that  
18 would be worthwhile, but I do not think we could do  
19 that.

20                  THE COMMISSIONER: You could not?

21                  MR. ROBB: I do not think it could be  
22 done.

23                  THE COMMISSIONER: I am not an education-  
24 ist, but if you try to give effect to every philosophy  
25 of education, you might have to have one hundred boards.

26                  MR. ROBB: That is correct. We have to  
27 have some restriction, some narrowing down, but we could  
28 not narrow it down to a very small channel. We feel  
29 this would be bad for children.  
30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't want to  
2 narrow it down to one board?

3 MR. ROBB: Yes, that is correct.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that because you  
5 do not think one board covering as large an area as  
6 Metropolitan Toronto could give effect to the different  
7 philosophies?

8 MR. ROBB: This is our feeling, sir.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, how does the  
10 philosophy -- you use the word; I think it is a little  
11 too strong -- but how does the implementation of these  
12 different approaches, if I may use that term, effect  
13 children when you consider the mobility of the popu-  
14 lation within the area? I understand that the rate of  
15 mobility is quite high.

16 MR. ROBB: Very high, sir. I have had  
17 experience with them, if I may speak personally for a  
18 moment, of children transferring in. Some children are  
19 able to take transferring in from one system to another  
20 without any problem. Others can move within the system  
21 itself and it is a problem because they are unable to  
22 cope with the movement.

23 It is not only the difference in edu-  
24 cational approach, it is the difference with living in  
25 another area and making new friends; it is more than  
26 one thing. It is a multiple factor problem.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Doesn't it create a  
28 problem when the child is moved from an area where the  
29 tri-level system includes senior public schools to a  
30





1 system where the tri-level has the senior high school?

2 MR. ROBB: It would create a problem,  
3 yes, sir. They meet the problem, as I stated before,  
4 whether they are moving from one system to another,  
5 depending on the child. The child who is able to ad-  
6 just can adjust to many factors. The child who has  
7 difficulty adjusting has difficulty adjusting to one  
8 factor.

9 I have at the moment children under my  
10 care who have made moves. I can think of two children  
11 at the moment. One has a great problem and one has  
12 less of a problem because the second child is better  
13 able to cope with changes, with becoming part of the  
14 group.

15 I think you will find, sir, that teach-  
16 ers do all they can to help children adjust to new  
17 situations, and where the children are able to cope  
18 with changes, they are able to work better.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Wouldn't it be easier  
20 if the child could move from the Lakeshore to North  
21 York under a centralized system without the differenti-  
22 ation that faces them?

23 MISS EVANS: Would it be easier for a  
24 child to move from Lakeshore to any other area?

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Let us say North York.  
26 If there was only one system or one board.

27 MISS EVANS: It would be easier in the  
28 certain ways. If the entire functioning of the school  
29 board were taken over and each class at that child's  
30







1 grade level was working on the same textbooks, the same  
2 lessons, the same curriculum at the same moment of every  
3 day, you would eliminate one problem.

4                   However, as Mr. Robb pointed out, the  
5 majority of difficulty, the major part of the difficulty  
6 is in the emotional adjustment that a child experiences  
7 uprooting himself from one circle to a new environment.  
8 I will ask Mr. McNeil who is in North York to amplify.

9                   THE COMMISSIONER: I just cited North  
10 York as an example.

11                   MR. MC NEIL: Basically, sir, a problem  
12 like this is a problem in administration really. As  
13 has been suggested the ideal solution of the hypothetical  
14 problem which you pose would be a solution of standard-  
15 ization so that no matter which school the child would  
16 attend on any particular day he would be receiving a  
17 lesson which is consequent to the one he received at  
18 some other school yesterday.

19                   In administration then, this would be  
20 the only administration decision which is the perfect  
21 one. However, other than this, what does administration  
22 do? We have said here right now that this is a high  
23 rate. That is, it is high relative to what? Relative  
24 to some other district, some other town or city; high  
25 relative to the total pupil population which we are  
26 serving?

27                   Administration must make a decision  
28 based on the best for the most that they have under  
29 their jurisdiction. I would hazard a guess here that  
30





1 probably the most is closer to 90 percent and the moving  
2 population probably would not exceed 10 percent, so  
3 that in a situation like this I would think that a  
4 certain degree of variation here, although it promotes  
5 difficulty for the moving child, would be better for  
6 the system as a whole.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: The brief says: In-  
8 formed opinion suggests that the best type of education  
9 may be offered in systems large enough to provide con-  
10 tinuity of education from kindergarten to secondary  
11 school graduation, with various types of education at  
12 the secondary school level, but not so large that  
13 flexibility of action and community interest are lost.  
14 It would appear that systems that vary in size from  
15 3,000 to 75,000 students come within this range."

16 Isn't that a pretty wide range to put  
17 systems with 3,000 children in the same category as  
18 systems with 75,000?  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1                   MISS EVANS: It is an extremely wide  
2 range, as you undoubtedly noted. It fairly well matches  
3 the enrolment in the majority of school boards that we  
4 are concerned with at the moment.

5                   THE COMMISSIONER: In Metropolitan  
6 Toronto?

7                   MISS EVANS: In Metropolitan Toronto.

8                   THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I was wondering  
9 whether you did not really fix this on the basis of  
10 what exists in Toronto?

11                  MISS EVANS: No -- informed opinion, as  
12 we have cited. We will use as an example Dr. Albert  
13 Rose's report "The case against total amalgamation in  
14 Metropolitan Toronto" where he strongly supports the  
15 idea that a variation in philosophy, especially to  
16 size, also can contribute only to the betterment of  
17 education.

18                  We do not feel those figures are out of  
19 line. There are so many local communities within the  
20 bounds of Metropolitan Toronto who have over long years  
21 of history built up a strong tradition. This is some-  
22 thing that cannot be tampered with without detriment  
23 to the school system carried on within those local  
24 municipalities.

25                  An area of 3,000 school population where  
26 the educational system has been purposely designed to  
27 meet the needs of this population and the wishes and  
28 expectations of the parents concerned is a truly ef-  
29 fective school board -- just as effective as a system  
30







1 of the size of 75,000 where the same considerations  
2 have been thought of in the formulation of school  
3 policy.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: That is, assuming  
5 that the one with the 3,000 enrolment has the resources  
6 to provide the necessary educational facilities and  
7 services?

8 MISS EVANS: Yes. You will find, I  
9 think, that most of the school boards within this area  
10 (you have heard from so many of them) feel that they  
11 are able to supply those special services which they  
12 feel necessary for their school population.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: In your opening re-  
14 marks you referred to the relationship between the  
15 trustees and the people who elected them and the desir-  
16 ability of some closeness between them. Looking at  
17 the population of the different wards in the City of  
18 Toronto I find that public school supporters range from  
19 28,800 in Ward 7 to 61,000 in Ward 6. Do you think  
20 that there can be the closeness that you want under a  
21 system where the trustee represents so large a  
22 population, or do you think the Toronto school system  
23 is too big?

24 MR. MC NEIL: I would like to refer here  
25 to attendance at some of the meetings of the North  
26 York Board. We go over because we are interested.  
27 Almost inevitably at each meeting there will be a dele-  
28 gation from this community or that within the North  
29 York area and I think probably the only way to persuade  
30





1 you to accept the philosophy that there is a closeness  
2 between trustees and people, would be to refer you to  
3 the enthusiasm with which these people present their  
4 briefs to our board members.

5 Possibly some of the things which you  
6 may have read in the papers would concern such things  
7 as the briefs regarding religious education by parents'  
8 and ratepayers' associations in North York. One com-  
9 munity receives an agenda for a meeting which says  
10 they are going to enlarge a school and they do not  
11 like it and they present a brief to their members. This  
12 type of thing goes on very consistently and I would  
13 suggest that probably at over 90 percent of the North  
14 York Board meetings they hear a delegation from one of  
15 the communities within their system, and they are very  
16 enthusiastic in their presentation. They are very in-  
17 terested and they make for a strong communication  
18 between the trustees and the people.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: But you do not think  
20 that there would be the same understanding if a com-  
21 munity would appear before a central board?

22 MR. MC NEIL: Are you referring here to  
23 --

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You were describing  
25 conditions in North York.

26 MR. MC NEIL: Yes.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: And I am saying now  
28 could not a local community or area send a delegation  
29 to a central board if there were only one board? Would  
30







1 it not be as well received? Is that what you are  
2 saying?

3 MR. MC NEIL: Number one, sir -- if the  
4 area is as large as Metropolitan Toronto and the board  
5 had 22 members I would suggest that probably they  
6 would have so many briefs from individual people that  
7 they would have to split their board into 22 parts and  
8 still work full-time.

9 Secondly in the proposal as made by the  
10 Committee that worked under Mr. Medanik the proposal  
11 there is that there would be sort of a local set of  
12 people who would hear delegations and they would con-  
13 dense and summarize the remarks of the delegation and  
14 present them to a committee of the main board which is  
15 set up to hear summaries of the peoples' delegations.  
16 They in turn would summarize and present them to the  
17 Executive Committee of the Board, and then the Executive  
18 Committee of the Board takes it up at a Board meeting.  
19 I would suggest that this type of filtering would  
20 probably take the essence out of the original presen-  
21 tation.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You prefer the New  
23 England Town Meetings?

24 MISS EVANS: May Mr. Green say something  
25 to you?

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

27 MR. GREEN: Sir, on one occasion a  
28 member of the Toronto Board was a member of the Committee  
29 that produced the case for equalization of educational  
30





1 opportunity in Metro Toronto. He expressed to me at  
2 any rate the feeling that the Toronto system was too  
3 big, and felt for exactly this reason -- this is Dr.  
4 Robin Harris who is no longer a member of our board --  
5 he felt it would be very difficult for a trustee to  
6 maintain contact with the people he represented.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I noted that in your  
8 brief you suggest the possibility of dividing the City  
9 of Toronto system into two parts. That is why I raised  
10 that question.

11 Do you want to say anything about the  
12 contentious matter which has been mentioned to me most  
13 often and that is, (do not look so surprised) uniform  
14 salary schedules throughout the area?

15 MISS EVANS: I think we are prepared to  
16 state something on that. I would like to ask some of  
17 our O.T.F. members to express the O.T.F. policy on this.

18 DR. ROBINSON: The attitude of the  
19 Federation in this regard is quite clear. It is that  
20 if there be eleven boards then there are eleven em-  
21 ployers and eleven groups of employees. If there were  
22 to be one board as in the amalgamated suggestion then  
23 there would be one employer and one group of employees  
24 and salary negotiations would take place on that basis.  
25 We do object to having eleven groups of employees and  
26 eleven groups of employers but one attempt to control  
27 salaries across the whole group. We think this is a  
28 restraint.

29 If amalgamation goes through then we  
30





1 would be opposed to it from the views expressed in the  
2 brief on philosophical grounds. On economic grounds I  
3 think it would make very little difference to us.

4 It has been said, sir, that competition  
5 between the boards makes the situation difficult. For  
6 a long time we have attempted to make the Toronto School  
7 Boards in Metro understand that this is not where their  
8 competition lies. Toronto and Metro at the present  
9 time employ approximately 30 percent of the secondary  
10 school teachers in Ontario.

11 A cursory glance at the salary schedules  
12 for Ontario -- and I would be happy to leave a copy  
13 with you sir -- will show the competition in salaries  
14 is not in Metro but is actually outside of Metro. The  
15 Metro salaries are almost uniform at the present time,  
16 and the higher salaries occur in many places outside  
17 Toronto. So their difficulty in competition does not  
18 lie as between themselves; it lies as between them as  
19 a group and smaller municipalities outside of the  
20 Toronto area.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you care to say  
22 anything about the particular variation which has been  
23 discussed in a number of briefs; that is, the Etobicoke  
24 system as compared with other municipalities? If you  
25 do not want to you do not have to discuss that; but I  
26 have been told, as you know, that because of the master  
27 plan system (whatever it is called) in Etobicoke there  
28 is prejudice to the other boards.

29 MISS EVANS: I would like to comment.  
30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: If you consider that  
2 question unfair, do not answer it.

3 MISS EVANS: I do not consider it unfair  
4 at all. It is quite true that we are very aware of the  
5 prejudice felt by the other boards towards Etobicoke,  
6 but Etobicoke's system of category placement and payment  
7 is an individual matter. On paper it may seem that they  
8 are taking unfair advantage of the other boards. This  
9 is not true. The other municipalities in most cases  
10 have their own salary scale, their category placement  
11 and in their own areas, perhaps with less publicity.  
12 They are dealing with teachers, awarding them on the  
13 basis of qualifications, experience and responsibility.  
14 As I say, I think it is a matter of publicity where a  
15 lot of individual care is taken to award positions of  
16 increased responsibility and duties in the other areas.

17 Perhaps the difficulty that the other  
18 Boards feel they have with Etobicoke is that Etobicoke  
19 a good many years ago was the one Metropolitan School  
20 Board which found it unwise to try to conduct salary  
21 negotiations at a metropolitan level.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I suppose I could go  
23 on on education for the rest of the day, but I think we  
24 have covered the principal items. I was very interested  
25 in your brief and I want to thank you for your assistance  
26 and the help you have given.

27 MISS EVANS: Thank you.  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF THE  
LEASIDE PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

APPEARANCES:

MR. O.M. REICKER - President

MR. U.SINGLETON - Director

----

THE COMMISSIONER: The Leaside Property Owners' Association.

MR. REICKER: Mr. Commissioner, I represent the Leaside Property Owners' Association and would on their behalf summarize our brief as follows.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you give your name, please?

MR. REICKER: O.M. Reicker. I am sorry. The Leaside Property Owners' Association promotes co-operation between all government bodies and property owners, studies local problems of the property owners, formulates recommendations to governing bodies and promotes a better community spirit and an interest in good government.

Leasiders already pay a larger percentage of their tax dollar to the Metropolitan Toronto Government than most. In 1963 64 cents of every tax dollar collected in the Town of Leaside went to the Metropolitan government. The Leaside property owners would rather maintain the municipal entity of the town even at some financial sacrifice. We feel the small







1 municipality can and does give the specialized services,  
2 because they know the needs and wants of their citizens.  
3 Also it does not take weeks before any group can be  
4 heard. The elected officials and also the town em-  
5 ployees know the town and its problems and can and do  
6 give better and efficient service.

7               Hundreds of people in the Town of Leaside  
8 serve without remuneration on the Planning Boards and  
9 other important municipal committees and in this way  
10 every problem within the community is brought to light  
11 and positive action is taken immediately to clear and  
12 finalize these community problems.

13               I would like to say, sir, just adding,  
14 that the Leaside Property Owners' Association, I believe,  
15 is one of the strongest associations in the area. We  
16 attend every council meeting, every Board of Education  
17 meeting, every safety council meeting and anything else  
18 that is going on in the Town. We also have had a repre-  
19 sentative attending these meetings here to hear the  
20 briefs of the Town of Leaside and the Board of Education.  
21 Sometimes we call ourselves the "watchdogs".

22               Under the present system the friendly  
23 attitude of a local group tied together by a common  
24 pride in their town promotes active and congenial  
25 citizens. Leaside is one historical unit. We can see  
26 no good reason why its 50-year heritage should not be  
27 allowed to continue.

28               We are prepared to give up municipal  
29 control of certain services but not give up our political  
30





1 entity. That is shortly our brief, sir, and I submit  
2 it to you.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I gather you are op-  
4 posed to amalgamation?

5 MR. REICKER: Yes, we are, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you opposed to  
7 amalgamation with an adjoining municipality such as  
8 East York?

9 MR. REICKER: We have given that consi-  
10 deration and we still feel that we would like to carry  
11 on as we are, sir.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Would that be the  
13 lesser of two evils to you?

14 MR. REICKER: No.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I mean, amalgamation  
16 with East York rather than amalgamation of the whole of  
17 the area?

18 MR. REICKER: We would go for that.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You would consider  
20 that the lesser of two evils, would you?

21 MR. REICKER: Yes, we would.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Your views, of course,  
23 are the same as those of the Town and the School Board.  
24 I think I have all the information that I want now about  
25 the attitude of Leaside. Thank you very much.

26 MR. REICKER: Thank you, sir. I would  
27 just like maybe to add that we operate now -- the Town  
28 Council that we have, while we have our friends and foes,  
29 we do work for the people of Leaside and we do have a  
30





1 very wonderful co-operation from everybody. I just  
2 wanted to say that, sir. We have a wonderful group of  
3 people donating their services and doing a terrific  
4 job to keep Leaside nice, clean, nice gardens, flowers  
5 and everything like that. Thank you, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

7 I shall now adjourn until to-morrow  
8 morning at ten o'clock.

9  
10 ---WHEREUPON THE HEARING WAS ADJOURNED UNTIL THURSDAY,  
11 THE 7TH DAY OF MAY, 1964 AT TEN A.M.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

FIELD A1

PARTIAL-ONE BLDG.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No.

DATE

9 1964 MAY 17, 1964

#### OFFICIAL REPORTERS

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383





ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Thursday, May 7th, 1964,  
commencing at 10:00 a.m., et seq.

COMMISSION:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E, Q.C.,	Chairman
F.H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

COUNTY OF YORK

820 - 865

THE SOUTHERN SIX MUNICIPALITIES  
IN THE COUNTY OF YORK

866 - 882

TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL

883 - 906

\* \* \* \* \*





1 THE COMMISSIONER: The County of York.  
2 Will you be presenting the brief, Mr. Jones?

3 MR. JONES: Yes, I will, sir.  
4

5 ---

6 SUBMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF YORK  
7

8 APPEARANCES:

9 MR. MURRAY JONES, Planning Consultant

10 MR. A. H. RUTHERFORD, Warden

11 MR. J. D. LUCAS, Q.C., Counsel  
12  
13  
14

15 ----

16 MR. JONES: Mr. Commissioner, my position  
17 with regard to this brief is that my firm of Murray  
18 Jones and Associates was retained to assist the County  
19 in its preparation. The brief is the one adopted by  
20 the County Council for submission to the Royal Commission.  
21 Most of the brief contains background material on the  
22 history and development of the County, projection of  
23 that development and an attempt to analyze the legis-  
24 lative or legal relationships, statutory relationships  
25 that now exist and have existed for some time as between  
26 the Metropolitan Corporation and the County, and pre-  
27 vious to that with the City of Toronto.

28 It then attempts to deal with the issues  
29 in terms of the County's position, and the continuance  
30





1 of certain relationships, and puts its point of view  
2 forward with respect to another critical aspect of your  
3 terms of reference having to do with boundaries.

4 There are a considerable number of people  
5 in the room, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure whether you  
6 wish them introduced. I would like at the very least  
7 to suggest that Mr. Lucas, the County Solicitor, is  
8 with me, and Mr. Rutherford, the Warden of the County  
9 is here. I am afraid I will find it difficult and  
10 perhaps it would not be to your advantage if I attempted  
11 to list them all. I am afraid I might be embarrassed  
12 by forgetting some of the names in any event. When we  
13 come to the next brief on the Southern Six, Mr. Fraser  
14 I believe it is -- am I right?

15 MR. FRASER: Yes.

16 MR. JONES: The solicitor, will be avail-  
17 able for that part.

18 Now, it is my understanding from at-  
19 tendance at some early hearings that you have read each  
20 of these briefs, and consequently it is neither necessary  
21 nor desirable to proceed to any lengthy reading or ex-  
22 planation of them except perhaps in those sections  
23 which deal with recommendations. For this reason I do  
24 not propose to read or enlarge upon, except for questions  
25 from you, sir, the chapters in this brief having to  
26 do with the history of the County, Chapter 1, Chapter 2,  
27 on the growth and change, Chapter 3 on the projection of  
28 growth and change or Chapter 4. It seems to me that  
29 these four chapters are primarily and almost wholly  
30







1 factual in nature, or at least in Chapter 3 there is an  
2 opinion expressed in terms of future physical growth  
3 and change.

4           The brief was prepared in this fashion  
5 in order to provide you, sir, with the background  
6 against which you might judge the recommendations that  
7 follow. It is our hope that that will serve the  
8 purpose.

9           With respect to Chapter 5 on the Toronto  
10 and York Roads Commission, we have attempted to trace  
11 the origin of the relationship between the County and  
12 the City of Toronto in pre-Metropolitan days; have  
13 set out the relationship that has existed as between  
14 the County and Metropolitan Toronto since 1953, and  
15 we simply point out that it is the County's opinion  
16 that this relationship ought to be maintained in terms  
17 of the relative financial responsibility as among the  
18 County and Metropolitan Corporation and the Province  
19 of Ontario unless some basic change is made in this  
20 City-County responsibility for the suburban roads which  
21 is common throughout the Province and is not unique in  
22 the relationship which exists here. The County simply  
23 takes the view since the proportion of its total budget  
24 which must be utilized for road purposes is such a signi-  
25 ficant proportion of its total expenditure that any  
26 basic change to be made in the financial relationship  
27 could only be tolerable to its financial position or  
28 its financial abilities if the responsibility that is  
29 now borne by the Metropolitan Corporation were assumed  
30





1 by some other agency, and naturally the only one that  
2 comes to mind is the Province of Ontario.

3 Until such time as the basic legis-  
4 lation and financial arrangement that now obtains in  
5 the Province is changed, the present relationship and  
6 the present division of expenditures ought to continue.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: You know that it has  
8 been suggested to me in one brief Toronto should no  
9 longer contribute to County or Suburban roads? I take  
10 it that you do not think there has been any change in  
11 the past ten years which warrants changing the  
12 situation?

13 MR. JONES: The only change that has  
14 occurred in the past ten years in my view would be the  
15 much greater reliance of the increased population of  
16 the Metropolitan area, including the City of Toronto,  
17 on these suburban roads, and that admittedly there is  
18 a greater need for such roads for the inhabitants of  
19 the County, to be sure, but in proportional terms, the  
20 geographic position of the County of York, vis-a-vis the  
21 Metropolitan area is such that it is in the dominant  
22 corridor of movement between the urban area and the  
23 primarily recreation region of northern Ontario. For  
24 this and other purposes the suburban and County roads  
25 are being used much more than they were ten years ago  
26 by these residents. Consequently the only relationship  
27 is one of strengthening the relationship I suggest  
28 rather than any diminution of it.

29 The other function for which there is a  
30







1 statutory relationship between the Metropolitan  
2 Corporation and the County of York has to do with the  
3 administration of justice. Our brief in Chapter 6  
4 traces the history of this relationship, and indicates  
5 that at the present time or in the very recent past at  
6 least, the desire on the part of the County for pro-  
7 vision of Court facilities within its own geographic  
8 area has led to extensive discussions and negotiations  
9 both with the Metropolitan Corporation and with the  
10 Province of Ontario. The County takes the position,  
11 with respect, at the moment that these negotiations  
12 have carried to the point where it is anticipated at  
13 least that a conclusion will be reached and the  
14 County feels ought to be reached in the way in which  
15 it has already been started rather than for the  
16 Commission to be fundamentally concerned about this  
17 particular problem.

18 This was not put forward by the County,  
19 or is not being stated by me as in any way suggesting  
20 that this Commission does not have the responsibility  
21 nor the right under that responsibility to deal with  
22 this function of metropolitan government, and in deal-  
23 ing with it would, by its very legislative nature,  
24 have to concern the County of York. We simply suggest  
25 that this function is being actively reviewed by the  
26 three parties concerned. It is the County's hope that  
27 a satisfactory conclusion will be reached that will be  
28 acceptable to all three parties, and by that token I  
29 suggest that a recommendation from the Commission is  
30





1 not as vital in this respect as it might be if this  
2 situation were not as it is.

3 With respect to the Registry Office we  
4 simply point out in the County's view there is no need  
5 for any change in existing legislation. Provision has  
6 been made for the disposal of the County's portion of  
7 its assets in the existing Registry Office on a basis  
8 which is already established. There is no further  
9 argument or controversy about it, and it would be  
10 automatically put into being once the new Registry  
11 Division in the southern part of the County were  
12 created.

13 Consequently the County feels there is  
14 no issue which might concern the Commission with res-  
15 pect to Registry Offices and the part that they play  
16 as between the County and the Metropolitan Corporation.

17 The third area where there is a relation-  
18 ship between the County and the Metropolitan Corporation  
19 deriving from the Metropolitan Act is in the field of  
20 planning. Chapter 7 of the brief deals with this  
21 subject.

22 The position of the County in this res-  
23 pect has been influenced very directly and very sub-  
24 stantially by the fact that the County undertook im-  
25 mediately previous to the preparation of this brief  
26 a study of the planning requirements of York County  
27 which was conducted by my firm and which made it, I  
28 must admit, a lot easier to prepare these briefs be-  
29 cause we undertook much the same basic research for  
30





1 that study as was required for the inclusion in these  
2 briefs, or in this brief at least.

3 The County Council has adopted the  
4 recommendations that were made in principle. I am not  
5 personally aware at the moment as to the degree to  
6 which any implementation programme has been established,  
7 but I am aware that the position of the County Council  
8 in principle is that the need is felt for the establish-  
9 ment of professional planning advice at the County  
10 level to perform a number of functions of a staff  
11 nature in terms of research and advice on a great  
12 variety of matters; that the same group of profession-  
13 al persons, directly responsible to the County Council,  
14 would, under the policy adopted in the report, be made  
15 available for consultation to all of the local municipi-  
16 palities within the County.

17 As a result of this approach the County  
18 does not feel the necessity for creating a formal plan-  
19 ning area even though this is now possible under the  
20 legislation for the County to be defined as such, and  
21 the result of that position obviates the necessity of  
22 becoming involved in the very difficult question of  
23 the relationship such a County, a formal County planning  
24 unit would have to the Metropolitan Toronto planning  
25 area.

26 There would be on the surface at least  
27 an overlapping of the two areas, or at the very best  
28 a creation of a planning unit for a part of that part  
29 of the County, the eight municipalities not now included  
30







1 in the Metropolitan Toronto planning area.

2 These points are developed at consider-  
3 able length in this chapter, and the sections of the  
4 earlier report that I referred to have been quoted at  
5 length.

6 The final paragraph of the chapter sums  
7 up the County's position in this way: "The County  
8 Council intends to implement this report. It is recom-  
9 mended, therefore, that the legislative basis for plan-  
10 ning in the Metropolitan area remain substantially as  
11 presently enacted. It is the County's view that a  
12 combination of the geographical extent of the metro-  
13 politan planning area and the scope of the metropolitan  
14 official plan combined with the proposed County Planning  
15 Organization will provide for effective future planning  
16 for the area."

17 First of all, Mr. Commissioner, the  
18 County is not raising any great fuss about anything.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: A very peaceful brief.

20 MR. JONES: Yes. It was not deliberately  
21 so. It is just that the County is a very peaceful place  
22 and very peaceful people. The County takes the basic  
23 view that as we will see at the end of this brief it is  
24 not afraid of change when it is required, but wants to  
25 know where it is going before it makes it.

26 The last two pages of the brief deal  
27 with that part of your terms of reference having to do  
28 with the adequacy of the boundaries for the Metropolitan  
29 Corporation which obviously have a direct bearing on,  
30 or could have a direct bearing on the County of York.





1 I would like with your permission (and  
2 they are very short) to read the lasttwo chapters, if  
3 I may.

4 Chapter VIII is entitled "A Case for  
5 Structural Change in Metropolitan Toronto Affecting  
6 the Southern Boundary of York County."

7 I may say by way of preface that this  
8 brief was prepared on the publicly stated position  
9 taken by some other authorities many months prior to  
10 the hearings on the question of boundary changes and  
11 the County felt that it was necessary to put its  
12 position on record knowing that such briefs might very  
13 well be presented. So far to the best of my knowledge  
14 there have been -- well, there have been several  
15 briefs dealing withthis issue and there are more to  
16 be heard which will deal with this issue, I believe.  
17 None of them so far, to my knowledge yet at least,  
18 have made anything but a general policy or declaratory  
19 type of statement that it might be a good thing to do.  
20 This is the sort of approach that we have found so  
21 far.

22 North York Township, as I recall, I  
23 think quite properly took the position that it might  
24 be a good idea, but it ought to be studied. I think  
25 their approach was to say the least somewhat more  
26 appropriate than the position of some other briefs  
27 which, without any discussion of implications or  
28 reasons, simply suggested an arbitrary determination of a  
29 boundary.

30 The point of my interjecting that at this







1 time is that we feel, the County feels that there must  
2 be in such procedure at the very least an attempt made  
3 on the part of the proponents for such action to spell  
4 out why and indeed its implications. We have attempted  
5 on the other side to spell out in these two chapters  
6 some of the general implications at least that might  
7 result from an arbitrary decision of the type recommended  
8 to you.

9 "Continuity of Urban Development" -- and I am quoting  
10 Chapter VIII.

11 "Many persons and organizations have  
12 attempted from time to time to establish tests which  
13 could be used in determining whether a municipality  
14 or territory should be included within a metropolitan  
15 governmental area.

16 "In this area the Civic Advisory Council  
17 developed and applied such tests and presented the  
18 results as part of the evidence before the Ontario  
19 Municipal Board in its hearing on the application by  
20 Toronto for amalgamation. The report of the OMB stated  
21 that while the recommended boundaries of Metropolitan  
22 Toronto should not be considered permanent, it  
23 nevertheless could not agree with the Civic Advisory  
24 Council that Markham and Vaughan Townships and the  
25 incorporated municipalities within them should at that  
26 time be included in the new Metropolitan Corporation."

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I can tell you now  
28 that I have at least one brief, which I have not yet  
29 heard officially, that does recommend that Markham and  
30 Vaughan, indeed that the six southern municipalities do





1 incorporate in Metro.

2 MR. JONES: I am aware of one brief.  
3 I do not believe you have heard from the Metropolitan  
4 Toronto Board of Trade which recommends a political  
5 boundary exactly the same as the planning area boundary.  
6 I am aware of that.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: That is recommended  
8 in more than one of the briefs that I still have to  
9 hear. I mention that to you for your comment.

10 MR. JONES: I was about to comment that  
11 on the point of the two decisions taken at that time  
12 by the Civic Advisory Council, these were elaborated  
13 more than I have done so in Mr. Hardy's brief, as I  
14 read it, for the City of Toronto.

15 "Generally speaking, the tests applied  
16 by the Civic Advisory Council, and others, rested on  
17 the degree of continuous urbanization or probable  
18 urbanization and as a general guide must be considered  
19 as a valid approach to the creation of an urban political  
20 structure. The Royal Commission on Local Government  
21 in London, England used much the same tests but cited  
22 a number of factors in many specific cases where a  
23 literal application of the principle was not considered  
24 necessary.

25 "The circumstances that exist at this  
26 time in the Metropolitan Toronto area most certainly  
27 show that urbanization or proposed urbanization exists  
28 in a continuous fashion somewhat to the north of the  
29 Metropolitan Toronto boundary, in greater proportion  
30 to the west of Metropolitan Toronto and in a lesser







1 proportion to the east. Most of the present urbanization  
2 occurs along both sides of Yonge Street between Steeles  
3 Avenue and the northern limit of Richmond Hill and  
4 has come about as a result of a number of factors,  
5 not the least of which is the historical fact that  
6 this location was the shortest route between Lake  
7 Ontario and Georgian Bay." -- and because of the fact,  
8 I may add, of the development in relationship between  
9 Holland's Landing itself and the centre of the urban  
10 area.

11 "The best guide to future urbanization  
12 is to be found in the draft Metropolitan Toronto  
13 Official Plan which provides for an ultimate population  
14 of 200,500 persons in the urban southern part of the  
15 County within the Metropolitan Planning area. The  
16 proposed distribution of urban land uses shows an  
17 enlargement and filling in of the Yonge Street corridor  
18 and the development of lands in an east-west direction  
19 immediately adjacent to Steeles Avenue. Other  
20 population centres are proposed in the established  
21 urban areas of Woodbridge, Unionville, Markham Village  
22 and Stouffville with infilling of other smaller urban  
23 centres. Using the test, therefore, of existing or  
24 proposed continuous urban development it would appear  
25 that at least some part of the area of the municipalities  
26 adjoining Metropolitan Toronto qualify for inclusion  
27 in the corporate area of Metropolitan Toronto.

28 "At the present time the surplus of  
29 labour force in this area indicates a high degree of  
30 dependence on Metropolitan Toronto, since most jobs







1 are located in the latter area. Studies of traffic  
2 movement, and particularly the movement in rush hours,  
3 confirms the high degree of reliance on Metropolitan  
4 Toronto for providing job opportunities for a large  
5 part of the urban population in the Markham-Vaughan  
6 area. The development of urban land in conformity  
7 with the draft Metropolitan Official Plan should  
8 provide a better theoretical correlation between job  
9 opportunities and labour force but it is not  
10 anticipated that a pattern that differs from the one  
11 now existing in any other part of Metropolitan Toronto  
12 will result;" -- that is to say, employment and  
13 residence locations in the same area do not necessarily  
14 mean that persons live near their work. Historically  
15 in Metropolitan Toronto the only correlation found  
16 in that respect is to do with the length of time the  
17 work area has been established. There is a close  
18 correlation between living and work places in fairly  
19 direct relation to the length of time they have been  
20 established.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You are referring to  
22 New Toronto for example?

23 MR. JONES: I am referring to a number  
24 of such industrial centres, yes.

25 "Since this is the case, it does not  
26 follow that, should a closer correlation between  
27 employment and residence develop, this would  
28 overcome or diminish the dependence of this area  
29 on Metropolitan Toronto.  
30





1 "The Relation of Services to Urban Development"

2 "With continuous urban development comes the  
3 need to consider the provision of integrated urban  
4 services. This need has been one of the traditional  
5 reasons used for enlarging a municipal boundary. In  
6 this case there already exists a direct relation  
7 between Metropolitan Toronto and the southern part  
8 of the County in that metropolitan sewer services  
9 are being supplied to a part of the area and are  
10 proposed to be supplied to other parts in the future.  
11 The future Metropolitan Toronto water plan also  
12 provides for reservoirs and connecting trunk mains  
13 to be located in both Markham and Vaughan, so the  
14 primary purpose is to establish a technically  
15 satisfactory solution for storage and pressure in a  
16 grid system to serve the residents of Metropolitan  
17 Toronto. While a plan for storm sewers has not been  
18 evolved it is obvious that storm drainage from urban  
19 development north of Steeles Avenue as far north  
20 as the watershed boundary between Lake Ontario and  
21 Lake Simcoe will mean that storm water must flow  
22 directly through Metropolitan Toronto.

23 "The matter of roads has been dealt  
24 with more extensively in another part of this brief  
25 but for the purpose of this chapter it might be noted  
26 that there is now, and will be more so in the future,  
27 a most direct relation between the road needs of urban  
28 residents in the southern part of the County and the  
29 provision of road facilities within Metropolitan Toronto.  
30 The opposite situation is also evident; the need of







1 good roads in the County for the purpose of residents  
2 of Metropolitan Toronto.

3 "In summary it could be said, with  
4 considerable accuracy, that present and future  
5 urbanization adjoining the northern boundary of  
6 Metropolitan Toronto requires now, and will require  
7 even more in the future, a growing interdependence  
8 for the provision of urban services. If these facts  
9 constitute the test for change in political structure  
10 it would follow that the boundary of Metropolitan  
11 Toronto should be moved further north."

12 "Other Considerations"

13 "There are a number of other  
14 subsidiary reason that could be developed which would  
15 indicate the desirability of a change in the metro-  
16 politan boundary. The creation of the CNR marshalling  
17 yard and access lines immediately north of Steeles  
18 Avenue could be said to be a metropolitan facility  
19 with the benefits accruing from this installation  
20 (industrial development) being for the benefit of  
21 the Metropolitan Corporation. This point is simply  
22 one part of the basic facts stated at the beginning  
23 of this chapter which indicated that there was indeed  
24 provision for continuous urbanization to a limited  
25 extent north of the metropolitan boundary. The fact  
26 that a significant portion of this urban development  
27 will be 'balanced' by the existence of the rail  
28 facilities and its attendant industrial development,  
29 makes the area look particularly attractive for  
30 strengthening the tax base of the adjoining municipalities





1 in Metropolitan Toronto.

2 "It could also be argued that present  
3 plans for limiting urbanization north of Metropolitan  
4 Toronto might not prove feasible and the financial  
5 and technical limitation on the provision of urban  
6 services may well be overcome with increasing demand  
7 for accommodating increased population. The existence  
8 of an urban 'expressway' in the form of Highway 400 at  
9 the present time and proposed construction of Highway  
10 404 through Markham Township lends weight to this  
11 attitude.

12 "An extensive part of the County drains  
13 to Lake Ontario and the existence of a Metropolitan  
14 service system which is limited in its present  
15 construction to serving the people of the Metropolitan  
16 Corporation and only small areas beyond may not be  
17 adequate when it is considered that future growth  
18 of the metropolitan area may require a much more  
19 extensive area of land than is now allocated. The  
20 question is one of time. It is conceivable that  
21 before the end of the century it may be necessary to  
22 consider supplementing the present service system of  
23 Metropolitan Toronto with an entirely new system which  
24 could very well mean an 'express' trunk main system  
25 running through the metropolitan area but serving  
26 areas beyond.

27 "Still another argument could be  
28 developed to the effect that the urban populations  
29 adjoining Metropolitan Toronto (in this case to the  
30 north) should be required to pay their fair share of







1 the cost of Metropolitan facilities. This argument  
2 is as old as the history of municipal annexations.  
3 On the whole, therefore, a simple approach to the  
4 problem would indicate that the existence and  
5 projection of a future continuous urban area outside  
6 Metropolitan Toronto with its necessary dependence  
7 on certain metropolitan services would indicate the  
8 propriety of extending the boundary of the governmental  
9 area to better fit the physical and social metro-  
10 politan area."

11 There are those who would say, Mr.  
12 Commissioner, that it is a nice brief up to now; why  
13 don't you stop there? I must say that there were  
14 people in the County who felt we did too good a job  
15 in proving the other guy's case. In Chapter IX I  
16 attempt to state the opposite point of view and the  
17 County reached the conclusion that Chapter IX  
18 outweighs Chapter VIII. But we felt that it was only  
19 appropriate in this kind of serious examination of  
20 the future governmental structure in this area to try  
21 to point out possible alternatives so that a better  
22 decision might be made.

23 "A Case for Maintaining the Present Boundary Between  
24 Metropolitan Toronto and the County of York"

25 "In the County's view there are a  
26 number of significant arguments which can be used to  
27 substantiate a case for maintaining the present  
28 boundary of Metropolitan Toronto.

29 "The first relates to the arguments  
30 developed in the previous chapter concerning continuity







1 of urban development and the consequent need for some  
2 integration of urban services. This would be a good  
3 argument if no other considerations were to apply.  
4 In other words, if adequate controls did not exist  
5 precisely determining the extent and location of urban  
6 development; if controls were not available for  
7 determining the location, capacity and methods of  
8 operation of such services as sewage disposal and  
9 water supply; if an organization such as the  
10 Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority  
11 with its approved programmes for flood and pollution  
12 control did not exist, then it could very well be  
13 argued that political control over the urban fringe  
14 was a vital necessity."

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think that  
16 adequate controls do exist?

17 MR. JONES: Yes, on the whole I do. I  
18 am sure you have something specific in mind and I would  
19 be quite happy to comment on any specific point that you  
20 have.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just wondering  
22 if you can really control the projected urban  
23 development on the basis of planning -- whether control  
24 by planning is enough. In the previous chapter you  
25 referred to the expressways.

26 MR. JONES: Yes.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Going north.

28 MR. JONES: Yes.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you not think  
30 those expressways well may force departures from the





1 projected urban development limits?

2 MR. JONES: I would suggest that the  
3 existence of those urban expressways could have the  
4 effect -- very well could have the effect of acting  
5 in a conflicting manner to the negative controls that  
6 are attempting to be implemented and those stopping  
7 urbanization. I think there is an inherent conflict  
8 in here.

9 But it seems to me that the factors  
10 on the other side outweigh the pull that these  
11 expressways by themselves might have.

12 In these terms I think it unfortunate,  
13 but my experience in this area and in the Province is  
14 that we have not found it as a community necessary  
15 to take land use planning terribly seriously. That is  
16 to say, still in a great many places the use of an  
17 area of land -- and I am not talking about small  
18 scale; I am talking about regional programmes -- and  
19 plans for land use are considered by many to be simply  
20 a holding device, you know, until it is ready for some  
21 other use and that there is still a great deal of free-  
22 dom given to the interchangeability of land uses and  
23 to the rate at which land is used and the direction in  
24 which it is used.

25 What is basic, it seems to me, is that  
26 we do our planning very much by the end of a sewer pipe  
27 and the simple fact is that the very high amount,  
28 large amount of expenditures that have been made by  
29 Metropolitan Toronto was based on a sewer plan created  
30 in early 1954 -- approved early 1954 prior to any







1 research-come-planning approach to the metropolitan  
2 area.





1           An arbitrary decision was made at that time  
2       to extend those facilities so that they would serve in  
3       a north-south direction to the limits of the Metropolitan  
4       area.     It was not part of the plan to serve areas  
5       beyond that.     It just so happened, and I am particularly  
6       familiar with this because I was very much involved in  
7       the details of the negotiations, to utilize any surplus  
8       in those types to serve small areas outside and to try  
9       and get as much of the sewage system oriented to Lake  
10      Ontario.

11           However, the reason I answered yes to your  
12      question, with the increase in degree of control and  
13      standards of specifications which translate into  
14      costs that are being employed by the primary agency  
15      concerned with the standards and provision of these  
16      services, the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and  
17      particularly in any policy which is adhered to at all  
18      in terms of the ratio between the volume of applica-  
19      tions and volume of stream flow in order to get a  
20      decent ratio will in fact from my knowledge and my  
21      experience limit the degree to which extensive  
22      facilities of this sort -- and this applies even  
23      more so to water supply, of course -- for local develop-  
24      ment, and that any extensive development -- I think  
25      this fact is capable of documentation and has in fact  
26      been documented in other documents, notably the draft  
27      Metropolitan official plan -- that any extensive  
28      development would not in fact necessitate an entirely  
29      new layer of services.

30           Consequently, to answer your question "Can





1 you control through planning?" if you will accept  
2 the range, the controls which I call planning, not just  
3 a coloured land use map, then it seems to me that I do  
4 not know of any better combination that has been  
5 rationally determined, interrelated, than the one that  
6 we have.

7 If the degree of control which has a negative  
8 side<sup>is</sup>/combined with a degree of positive approach towards  
9 planning for development of areas which can in fact be  
10 serviced, and as you well probably know the fundamental  
11 policy of urban development in this region is still  
12 east-west development, on a broad scale basis for that  
13 very simple reason.

14 This is a long way to answer your question,  
15 but I feel confident that the combination of both  
16 positive and negative policies that do exist, and the  
17 strength of the organizations which are operating the  
18 system is of a fundamentally different character and  
19 quality than it was in 1953. I think the position of  
20 official plans and planning, and particularly land use  
21 planning and its component parts I think are being  
22 taken much more seriously today than they were in 1953  
23 even though I would still feel that they are not really  
24 taken as seriously as some of us might like to see them  
25 taken, but we have moved a long way in ten years.

26 THE CHAIRMAN: The negative factor which  
27 you mention may be more important than the actual plans  
28 which are available perhaps?

29 MR. JONES: These are the tools for plan-  
30 ning, sir, if I may put it that way. Be they negative







1 or positive, they are literally the day-to-day  
2 tools that we use in our type of political economy. It  
3 is just as simple as that.

4 Many things have happened since 1953 which  
5 can and do act as effective substitutes for expansion  
6 of political territories. The existence of the Metro-  
7 politan Toronto planning area, the powers contained  
8 in the Metropolitan Act with respect to the official  
9 plan, the active and coordinated programmes of the  
10 Conservation Authority and the role of the Ontario  
11 Water Resources Commission all combine to produce the  
12 basis for physical, policy and financial planning  
13 which did not exist previously. The case of certain  
14 services illustrates this point. A definite and long-  
15 range plan is in existence for serving the future urban  
16 areas in the southern part of the county with Metro-  
17 politan services, in part, being extended to the limit  
18 of their capacity on a simple contractual basis and  
19 with the balance of the area being served by a limited  
20 system of local facilities, so located and controlled  
21 as to provide adequate local services and at the same  
22 time not causing difficulties for the residents of  
23 Metropolitan Toronto.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think the powers  
25 in the Metropolitan Act which are conferred on the  
26 Metropolitan Corporation are adequate?

27 MR. JONES: Adequate for the purpose of  
28 controlling these things?

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

30 MR. JONES: No, as a matter of fact there





1 is very little in the Metropolitan Act on this point.  
2 The power rests with the Minister of Municipal Affairs,  
3 and it is through that provincial department that this  
4 whole point is being directed.

5 I would think offhand that the granting  
6 of powers by the province to the Metropolitan Corpora-  
7 tion to have such a degree of direct and legislative  
8 control over the actions of an adjoining political  
9 jurisdiction would have some fairly serious ramifica-  
10 tions. I would think that the present means by which  
11 such relations are handled at the mother level, the  
12 provincial level, is still basically the same.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Has the Metropolitan  
14 Planning Board controlled development in what are  
15 called the fringe areas? I will talk about the  
16 southern part of the County of York.

17 MR. JONES: I think the answer is a re-  
18 sounding yes on that point. I must admit that I am  
19 maybe somewhat prejudiced in respect to this, having  
20 been so directly associated with it. I am thoroughly  
21 conscious of the relationship that developed between  
22 the Metropolitan Planning jurisdiction and the area  
23 within the planning area but outside Metropolitan  
24 Toronto. I am perfectly aware that at the same time  
25 that control was being exercised through advice to the  
26 Minister and through personal persuasion of staff at  
27 other levels, and there was on the part of the boards,  
28 as you will see in other briefs that you will get,  
29 very considerable concern with the maintenance of the  
30 independence of this political jurisdiction.







1 I would not like to suggest that in all  
2 cases the type of control which the Board at that  
3 particular point in time felt necessary was always  
4 adopted. I am not suggesting that it was an airtight  
5 situation, but on the whole I think that is true.

6 It may be somewhat naive to suggest that  
7 such a relationship could continue, although quite  
8 frankly I would be hard put to think in terms of  
9 actions for instance in the immediate future which  
10 could prove my position untenable. I must be terribly  
11 prejudiced because I am simply incapable of developing  
12 arguments against myself in that respect. I would  
13 like to hear them and then I will be prepared to  
14 comment.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: You are saying the  
16 Planning Board has exercised effective control?

17 MR. JONES: Yes, on the whole I think this  
18 is true.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Outside of the Metro-  
20 politan Corporation?

21 MR. JONES: Yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: And that was actually  
23 because of positive acts by the Board? Quite frankly  
24 I feel that perhaps there were negative controls such  
25 as financial inability of the municipalities to provide  
26 the services which would have increased urbanization.

27 MR. JONES: No question about that, sir.  
28 The lack of ability on the part of the independent  
29 municipalities to fight our position reinforced our  
30 ability. There is no question about that whatsoever.





1 I won't go further I do not think with that one at  
2 the moment.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I was not questioning  
4 the fact that there was control. I just want to clarify  
5 these things in my own mind.

6 MR. JONES: The only point I would like  
7 to make in summary of this is that I do not think a  
8 truthful answer can be obtained simply by looking at  
9 the historic relationship between the Metropolitan  
10 planning organization and the so-called fringe areas  
11 because this is one development of many.

12 I would think you have to look at the total  
13 relationships that have developed. There is a growing  
14 awareness, and more acutely expressed, of course, in  
15 people who are engaged in this business every day than  
16 perhaps the general public, but there is a growing  
17 awareness of the interrelationships that exist in  
18 the Metropolitan region as between a great number of  
19 things; not the least of which is the relationship  
20 between the direction and route and type of urban  
21 growth and the physical and financial possibilities  
22 of providing it with basic services of all kinds --  
23 in this case, notably water and sewers. There was  
24 not the degree of concern or knowledge about the  
25 interdependencies in any precise way. These have  
26 been developed. I would still like to think with  
27 knowledge that we can hope to exercise greater -- hope  
28 to make more intelligent decisions, I think, than have  
29 been made.

30 As indicated earlier, the basic issue is





1 a question of the timing of further extensive urbaniza-  
2 tion not presently contemplated. An analysis of pre-  
3 sent and proposed urbanization north of the boundary  
4 of Metropolitan Toronto is being developed in such a  
5 way and with such controls as to not warrant political  
6 control by Metropolitan Toronto in order to protect  
7 its interests. Should it become necessary in the  
8 future to contemplate another extensive area of  
9 urbanization much larger than that now proposed, it  
10 would obviously have to result in a change in political  
11 organization for the simple reason that it would in-  
12 volve the creation of an extensive new system of  
13 "Metropolitan" services.

14 It is the view of the county that should  
15 this situation develop twenty or thirty years from now  
16 that there will be sufficient time to consider the  
17 appropriate changes in the political structure, and  
18 consequently action at this time, that far in advance  
19 of possible needs, is completely unwarranted.

20 From another point of view, any expansion  
21 of the Metropolitan Toronto boundary to the north must  
22 involve a close examination of the financial effect  
23 on the remaining county and the municipalities directly  
24 affected, and must also involve serious examination  
25 of an entirely different concept for county organization.

26 At the present time the southern six  
27 municipalities in the county and in the Metropolitan  
28 Toronto planning area pay 52 per cent of county levies.  
29 While it is not possible to precisely determine the  
30 proportion of county expenditures in each municipality,







1 it is safe to say that should the southern six muni-  
2 cipalities be separated from the county, an intolerable  
3 financial burden on the eight remaining county munici-  
4 palities would result.

5 For the purpose of this discussion it is  
6 assumed that any boundary change would include whole  
7 municipalities since, as indicated by many authorities  
8 such as the Cumming Report and the London Royal  
9 Commission Report, only under extreme circumstances  
10 should part of an existing political territory be  
11 separated, unless either a municipality is formed or  
12 annexation to an existing political unit takes place.

13 The simple fact is that if only the lower  
14 portion of municipalities such as Markham and Vaughan  
15 were annexed to Metropolitan Toronto it would result  
16 in a most serious effect on the existing and potential  
17 tax base of those municipalities, and hence the county  
18 as a whole.

19 Incidentally, Mr. Commissioner, I think it  
20 was on this point Mr. Hardy raised this issue, but  
21 came to no conclusion in his brief, and suggested if  
22 the boundary were to be changed it might simply fit  
23 the urban development limit as contained in the draft  
24 Metropolitan plan, but did not come to any recommenda-  
25 tion. This is the type of thing I am talking about  
26 here. The necessary result of such action would  
27 simply be renewed efforts to reconstitute another  
28 balanced tax base which would surely involve repeating  
29 efforts at industrialization and therefore general  
30 urbanization.





1 At the present time many of the municipali-  
2 ties in the county are experiencing increased diffi-  
3 culty in raising revenues without causing undue burden  
4 on what is still an agricultural economy. The planning  
5 objective must be to create an economic base which  
6 minimizes unbalanced urban growth and at the same time  
7 permits economic operation of agricultural lands.

8 It is fully appreciated by the county  
9 council that this objective is difficult to attain,  
10 but it feels strongly that to remove the responsibility  
11 of balanced urban assessment can only make the economic  
12 use of the vast majority of the land area for agricultural  
13 purposes more difficult. By the same token the in-  
14 clusion of large agricultural areas into the funda-  
15 mentally urban complex of Metropolitan Toronto would  
16 also have the effect, despite recent amendments to  
17 the Assessment Act concerning farm assessment, of  
18 increasing the tax load on the owners of agricultural  
19 lands.

20 This is one of those general statements,  
21 Mr. Commissioner, which I do not like other people to  
22 make, but I had to make at the time of writing this  
23 brief on the ground I was not able to try to calculate  
24 what the effect might be. Since that time I have found  
25 it equally impossible to do, but I have attempted to  
26 prepare some general indicators as to what might be  
27 the case. For instance, I found that in averaging  
28 farm assessment in Markham and Vaughan townships, and  
29 using a unit of a 100-acre farm, the assessment for  
30 that 100-acre farm in 1951 was \$6,300. In 1961 it was







1 \$13,000, for a 106 per cent increase, which, compared  
2 with the values of produce sold from this same farm  
3 of \$5,100 in 1951 and \$7,545 in 1961, or an increase of  
4 .48 per cent whereas the level of taxation during the  
5 same period on these same farms, and applied to a  
6 theoretical 100-acre farm, rose from \$265 in 1951 to  
7 \$829 in 1961, or a 212 per cent increase.

8 What I was trying to establish was the  
9 rate of increase in taxation as a proportion of income,  
10 and then attempted to relate this to what might be the  
11 situation if suddenly this area were placed in Metro-  
12 politan Toronto, and this is where it is quite impos-  
13 sible really to do except that your answer is subject  
14 to a great percentage error. But it would appear  
15 from the analysis we have been able to make having  
16 regard to the assessment practices used in Metropoli-  
17 tan Toronto on bona fide farm land under the recent  
18 amendment, Section 35 of the Assessment Act, and having  
19 regard to the same factors which are used in applying  
20 it to Vaughan Township, we came to the conclusion there  
21 might be anywhere between 25 per cent and 100 per cent  
22 increase in the assessed valuation placed on the farms  
23 in Vaughan at least as a result of this, and that  
24 if the tax rates which are now fairly comparable were  
25 applied it might very well mean an increase in the  
26 tax load of anywhere between 25 per cent and 100 per  
27 cent.

28 I do not put these forward, Mr. Commissioner,  
29 as categorical and well-documented figures. I am  
30 putting them forward only from what we have been able





1 to find out as indicative of a kind of thing that might  
2 be involved.

3 I did not dwell on it because I did not  
4 want to make this a major point in what I am saying at  
5 all. Simply it derives from the general statement  
6 I have made in the brief to the effect that there  
7 would be this danger of further affecting the dominant  
8 part of the economic base or economy, at least of these  
9 areas which are agricultural, by the application of  
10 any further urban cost.

11 I am aware as you are, sir, of the existence  
12 of special legislation which applies in Oakville -- the  
13 only place I know in Ontario that it does apply --  
14 which created an urban service district in effect  
15 and which legislation specifically prohibits the  
16 application of practically any urban cost outside of  
17 a very well defined area. It is an interesting  
18 piece of legislation, and I think it probably goes  
19 much further than any attempts previously made by  
20 amendments to the Assessment Act, attempts to set  
21 up a policy to keep a large municipal corporation  
22 going where a large part of the land area is now  
23 used and would likely be used for agricultural pur-  
24 poses for a long time. In other words, the political  
25 boundary in that case was changed by amalgamation of  
26 Oakville and Trafalgar Township, and it soon became  
27 evident that this political solution had to be supple-  
28 mented by an economic solution, by enactment of this  
29 special legislation.

30 Now, it is interesting it seems to me by





1 comparison, in the next adjoining municipality, the  
2 Toronto Township, a year or two earlier, special legis-  
3 lation was obtained to do exactly the reverse whereby  
4 the cost of provision of an urban sewer system in the  
5 south end of the township was, under that legislation,  
6 required to be charged to the whole township including  
7 all the farmers who will never have an opportunity of  
8 using it. I am simply comparing these two by way of  
9 suggesting there is no apparent pattern developing  
10 in legislation in this area.

11 I am bringing it forward to raise a basic  
12 question that you well know, sir, by the inclusion of  
13 large rural areas within an urban political jurisdiction,  
14 fundamentally urban political jurisdiction, if there is  
15 any concern which I suggest there must be for the  
16 continued economic operation of farmland, there must  
17 be some method devised as part of that creation to  
18 enable this to happen. Otherwise I suggest it is  
19 not terrible intelligent and borders on something  
20 worse than that in my view. I think the problems  
21 associated with the rural fringe of the urban area  
22 is one of the matters which has not received sufficient  
23 attention in the recent past.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you saying that as  
25 a threat?

26 MR. JONES: I am in no position to issue  
27 a threat, Mr. Commissioner.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: On another Royal Com-  
29 mission on which I sat the farmers went much further.  
30 They cited figures like those which you cited and then







1 announced they are going on a tax strike.

2 MR. JONES: That wouldn't surprise me.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: That was in another  
4 province. I was going to ask you, Mr. Jones, in  
5 considering the rural urban set-up of the county whether  
6 you would favour urban serviced areas within the county?  
7 I am not talking now about ---

8 MR. JONES: May I come to that in my  
9 next brief?

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

11 MR. JONES: I would prefer to because I  
12 think it is more relevant to the next brief.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

14 MR. JONES: The second part of this problem  
15 has to do with the economic and political effect on the  
16 remaining county. If Metropolitan Toronto as a  
17 political organization, and a very effective political  
18 organization, is to continue to increase the number of  
19 local municipalities in the federation then serious  
20 consideration has to be given to a reorganization of  
21 the remaining counties from which such local municipali-  
22 ties would be removed.

23 You will notice rather than trying to write  
24 this from several alternate points of view of amalgama-  
25 tion or confederation of boroughs or what not, I really  
26 couldn't frankly be bothered to relate it to any of  
27 those. The combinations and permutations have made it  
28 quite impossible.

29 The original geographic areas of the  
30 counties, including those along the north shore of Lake





1 Ontario, were created in a non-urban era. They have  
2 a large frontage on the lake and extend in a perpen-  
3 dicular direction to the north. The growth of large  
4 urban centres which are fundamentally circular in shape,  
5 or semi-circular in the case of Metropolitan Toronto,  
6 cuts directly across this series of parallel north-  
7 south lines. It may very well be that the time has  
8 come to consider county reorganization in a similar  
9 semi-circular manner or perhaps in an east-west direction  
10 paralleling the urban region developing along the  
11 shore of Lake Ontario.

12 The parts of two or more remaining counties  
13 could then be joined in a new form of federated or  
14 county system of local government concerned with the  
15 very special needs of that large territory which now  
16 exists between the principal urban centre and the  
17 truly agricultural hinterland. As I stated earlier,  
18 this purity of function hardly exists in the southern  
19 part of Ontario. There are large areas of lands which  
20 are predominantly rural, and there is an increase in  
21 the amount of land lying between this latter area and  
22 the major urban centres which, while part of the  
23 Metropolitan region, is nevertheless a distinctive  
24 new form of settlement for which new political organiza-  
25 tion might be required.

26 The county therefore, and with great  
27 respect, suggests that the present and future physical,  
28 social, economic and political problems between the  
29 present Metropolitan Toronto and the present County of  
30 York would not be solved by the simple expedient of







1 extending the Metropolitan boundary.

2 For the next twenty to thirty years at least  
3 there appears to be in my judgment and certainly in  
4 the judgment of the county council entirely adequate  
5 means available for ensuring a workable arrangement  
6 through the legislative and administrative institutions  
7 which have been devised in the past ten years. There  
8 is no evidence that can be brought forward which proves  
9 that any change in the Metropolitan boundary would  
10 benefit either of the two organizations and their  
11 citizens.

12 The county recognizes that it is desirable  
13 to make political adjustments both in terms of structure  
14 and in terms of function to suit rapidly changing needs.  
15 There is a growing awareness of the relationships which  
16 do exist in this increasingly interdependent urban  
17 society, and the county is constantly making better  
18 preparations for assessing its needs and its relation  
19 to the needs of others. The county will in the future  
20 attempt to bring about changes which it feels are  
21 required, but it does not feel that any basic changes  
22 are required at this time.

23 That is the end of the County of York  
24 brief, Mr. Commissioner.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: In the course of the  
26 brief, Mr. Jones, you recommend that the legislative  
27 basis for planning in the Metropolitan area remain  
28 substantially as presently enacted?

29 MR. JONES: In so far as it relates -- and  
30 this is implied rather than stated implicitly -- in so





1 far as it relates to the continued existence of a  
2 Metropolitan Toronto planning area, in so far as that  
3 planning area extends into part of the County of York.  
4 The county in this brief is not attempting to suggest  
5 a whole range of possible legislative changes which  
6 might be made in terms of function and in terms of  
7 scope, and in terms of a number of other relationships.  
8 This is only in reference to two basic elements, one  
9 the geographic area which is not legislated directly --  
10 just indirectly.-- in that the act provides for the  
11 Minister to define whatever area he wishes. Secondly,  
12 that the fundamental function of a general plan for  
13 the Metropolitan planning area to be prepared by the  
14 general authority and by the continued existence of  
15 local planning organizations which may change in  
16 their function from time to time. I would personally  
17 like to see changes in that respect, but no fundamental  
18 change in that function, in its functional relation-  
19 ships, are considered necessary.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: In so far as the area  
21 is concerned I gather that you agree the area should  
22 extend beyond the border of the Corporation of  
23 Metropolitan Toronto?

24 MR. JONES: Yes, I do.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you extend the  
26 area still further than at present? The area now  
27 covers the thirteen municipalities in Metro and the  
28 thirteen municipalities outside. Would you go beyond  
29 that?

30 MR. JONES: In certain areas I would. Not





1 necessarily in York County.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I see.

3 MR. JONES: There are some other areas  
4 which I could name which I think are vitally a part  
5 of the Metropolitan Toronto planning complex.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Considering the con-  
7 stitution of the Metropolitan Planning Board and its  
8 responsibility in relation to the Metropolitan Council,  
9 do you think that it can perform its functions fairly  
10 to the outside municipalities?

11 MR. JONES: That is a very good question,  
12 Mr. Commissioner. How does one answer it? By ten  
13 years of experience or by speculating on what could  
14 happen?

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Take the first.

16 -

17 -

18 -

19 -







1 MR. JONES: I will take the first.

2 Again I would have to say that the prejudiced evidence  
3 which I could give on that point -- biased; I will  
4 make it the word "biased"; "prejudiced" has a  
5 different connotation -- I know of no instances I  
6 can recall. Someone may recall. They told me, and  
7 I quite agree with it, but I cannot recall offhand  
8 any substantial case of issueship which involved a  
9 difficulty on the part of the Board as between these  
10 two primary responsibilities.

11 I am thinking for instance, a large  
12 part of my job was going about to the 26 municipalities  
13 and I recall, sir, some of the people sitting in this  
14 room in the County of York and some of the municipalities  
15 in the south end a number of times claiming in effect  
16 that the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board was in  
17 an untenable position because it must protect -- it  
18 must as an advisor to the Metropolitan Corporation  
19 protect the financial interest, hence the tax base  
20 of that municipality.

21 This was the reason why there were  
22 suspicions that the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
23 Board did not want to have industrial areas created  
24 north of Steeles Avenue. This was the feeling. All  
25 I can say is that it was a feeling that was unjustified.  
26 There is no tangible evidence that I am aware of to  
27 substantiate it, and I think I was in a fair position  
28 to know.

29 As I say, I think that the basic  
30 position the Board is taking is one of trying to allow





1 for the independent operation of an independent  
2 political jurisdiction that was within this planning  
3 area to the greatest possible degree and only becoming  
4 concerned with its activities when there was a direct  
5 impingement.

6 Certainly in the case of an issue such  
7 as the Board's position over the creation of upstream  
8 sewage plants, a similar position of the Conservation  
9 Authority's interest in this, to an extent did  
10 protect or attempt to protect the Corporation's  
11 interest by way of attempting to specify on advice  
12 from the Metropolitan Works Commission as to where  
13 the sewage plants ought to be -- half a mile above or  
14 the general policy of Steeles Avenue, from a sanitary  
15 engineer's point of view to allow for some degree of  
16 erosion, filtration in effect, to take place through  
17 mixture with the stream prior to this hitting the  
18 metropolitan areas, so if the plant were not operating  
19 properly at least we would have some chance.....

20 This is the kind of thing that really,  
21 I think, happened. But I do not count this as a  
22 substantial thing. Substantially it seems to me that  
23 the Metropolitan Planning Board would have to say  
24 that it is bad to have any sewage plants north of  
25 Steeles Avenue; you do not want anybody in Metro  
26 to be affected and therefore you must have them here.  
27 If that were the position taken I would appreciate  
28 it would be a substantial thing; but it was not.

29 I am trying to think of others. If  
30 some come to mind.....







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think there  
2 are too many planning authorities or too many with  
3 their fingers in the planning pie in this area?

4 MR. JONES: I do not think the problem  
5 is one of numbers, Mr. Commissioner, at all.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: What is the problem?

7 MR. JONES: In a few short words it is  
8 very difficult. One of the problems has been, I  
9 think, a confusion of responsibility in the sense that  
10 particularly after the Metropolitan Act, where there  
11 was no attempt to spell out in that legislation any  
12 different roles as between the central and the unit  
13 organization. Admittedly there was a rule laid down  
14 for the central planning authority in terms of the  
15 minimum requirements of an official plan; but that is  
16 all.

17 The result of this has been that prior  
18 to the Metropolitan Corporation a number of municipali-  
19 ties in the whole area had proceeded under the 1946  
20 provincial legislation to adopt official plans and  
21 adopt so-called implementing zoning by-laws and a  
22 number of other features. Even with the superimposition  
23 of the general authority a basic change took place so  
24 that in effect the role assumed by the local authority,  
25 which should have changed as a result of the establish-  
26 ment of the general authority, just did not come about.

27 Consequently, I think it is fair to  
28 say, and I feel personally strongly about this, I  
29 think in the question of general land use planning  
30 it is an absolute contradiction to suggest that there





1 can be an effective regional land use plan and a  
2 series of municipal land use plans. There can be  
3 if one is simply a direct cutting out and adoption  
4 of the other, providing it is done the right way around.

5 But it is my own view that the function  
6 of local planning units is a very vital function,  
7 but it ought to be spelled out and changed to this  
8 extent. It seems to me the main role of a regional  
9 authority is much more in the field of economic  
10 planning as opposed to physical design. Economic  
11 planning is to the extent that we practise such a  
12 thing in this country at the base of the determination  
13 of the draft official plan.

14 The role of the local planning authority,  
15 it seems to me, ought to be orientated much more  
16 than it has been towards physical planning, physical  
17 design and -- if I may use a very old-fashioned term;  
18 as a political scientist I can use it; it is a thing  
19 which has gone out of the language -- civic art. It  
20 is, I would begin to think, more detailed and three-  
21 dimensioned, much on the European/English pattern.

22 I think the creation of the two levels  
23 made it possible to have two functions being performed.  
24 I think unfortunately it did not happen that way  
25 because at the same time as the putting on of the  
26 general organization the other one simply continued  
27 to do what they were doing previously. I think this  
28 was a great waste.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: You still think that  
30 provincial approval and intervention is necessary?





1 MR. JONES: This would be the local  
2 municipality and Metro?

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

4 MR. JONES: I would reduce it by about  
5 80 or 90% if I were doing it.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: By conferring some  
7 of the provincial powers on the Metro Board?

8 MR. JONES: Certainly; with the right  
9 of appeal naturally. But I think from my experience  
10 again that the fact of the matter is that the Province  
11 through its many branches never made any recognition  
12 in its own practices of the existence of the Metro-  
13 politan Corporation's planning operation really. And  
14 the fact that they were now a changed organization....  
15 The relationships have continued regarding the  
16 problems in the local municipality in always precisely  
17 the same way as they did prior to the fact of this  
18 changed organization. I would not go for this myself  
19 at all.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think the  
21 people you represent would find an increase in the  
22 powers of the Metropolitan Board acceptable?

23 MR. JONES: I do not know. I would  
24 not want to guess on that. I think they would have to.  
25 I do not think this issue, as I recall it, came up  
26 in our preparation or in my discussions with the  
27 County Council and I would not want to put words in  
28 their mouths. I would certainly advise them if I  
29 were asked (put it this way) to accept such a position  
30 because I think it is a very logical one.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Finally, Mr. Jones,  
2 I assume that you believe that the Metro Official  
3 Plan as it is or as amended -- that a Metro Official  
4 Plan should be adopted? The present plan, of course,  
5 is still a proposed plan.

6 MR. JONES: I think part of the answer  
7 to that is, adopted by whom?

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you tell me.

9 MR. JONES: Yes. Well, it could only  
10 be adopted in a legal sense, as you know, by the  
11 Minister of Municipal Affairs.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

13 MR. JONES: I think some further  
14 thinking on this point might indicate that particularly  
15 in the case of the Metropolitan Official Plan the  
16 degree of provincial interest that may be involved  
17 ought to be re-thought and that the nature of the  
18 official document -- which does not become such until  
19 approved by the Minister -- might stand some re-thinking  
20 because it is really patterned after the 1946  
21 legislation, which I think ought to have some review  
22 as well.

23 In that respect I think it is time  
24 that -- well, the relationship between the Province  
25 and municipality is a mother-child relationship. I  
26 think the fact of the matter is that children do, some  
27 of them, grow up and it is about time we recognized  
28 it. We do not all remain aged five and that is a  
29 fundamental assumption in many of the relationships.  
30 Some do. Some do not.





1 But in this particular case what  
2 has actually happened is that a great many of the  
3 basic policies contained in that document have been  
4 adopted, have been implemented. I think this is the  
5 most significant thing. I must admit that personally  
6 I have never been overly impressed with the great  
7 necessity to prove that you were planning by getting  
8 the Minister to approve an Official Plan, because most  
9 of them in this Province are not really simply what  
10 I would call planning exercises at all. Consequently  
11 I think it is almost fraudulent to suggest that just  
12 to adopt a piece of paper -- some of them I have seen  
13 practically on the back of the wallpaper sort of thing --  
14 that this constitutes great progress in planning. I  
15 think we are just kidding ourselves.

16 I am much more concerned with the  
17 content, with the development and the creation of a  
18 feeling of need, of practical day to day need and  
19 long term need on the part of an elected people that  
20 they need planning guidance and use it. I am much  
21 more concerned with that than I am with particular  
22 formal adoption of something.

23 I am aware that many municipalities  
24 have done so under previous legislation just to get  
25 a Committee of Adjustment, which was a requirement,  
26 and things of this sort, and the relationship between  
27 the official plan and the zoning by-law -- which most  
28 people in this Province have not the foggiest notion  
29 what it is is all about and what the relationship is  
30 (and I do not blame them quite frankly).







1                   So I am not impressed. I think there  
2 is the need to adopt a Metropolitan Official Plan by  
3 the Province in certain fundamental aspects that  
4 would put the Province in a position if it becomes  
5 concerned with regional planning per se so that it  
6 can have an intelligible basis on which to proceed to  
7 provincial planning if it goes that way. There is  
8 some indication that that may be so.

9                   Other than that the provincial concern  
10 is with rather grown up child of the Metropolitan  
11 Council who ought not to have the responsibility, I  
12 suggest, of adopting the plans for this purpose  
13 vis-a-vis these people that do not affect provincial  
14 considerations and get on with the job.

15                  The great problem that many people  
16 see is an administrative problem and once it becomes  
17 an official thing in all respects that are now  
18 required of it in the legislation, your hands are tied  
19 and you go through six months of this and that. It is  
20 quite real in some ways and unreal, I would suggest,  
21 in others -- simply on the part of some people, I think,  
22 an unwillingness to recognize that society is getting  
23 complex and administration becomes complex with it.

24                  But it does add to the decision-making  
25 difficulties, I think, by over-using and over-expending  
26 the necessity to have provincial approval. I think  
27 there is certainly the need -- not only the need; in  
28 fact it has happened in terms of metropolitan  
29 adoption and use in many of its aspects. It is used  
30 without any legal right in a great many decisions by





1 other bodies at the provincial level -- I would like  
2 to think simply because it is bloody well done. You  
3 see, this is the point. The research and analysis  
4 on a continuous and meaningful level -- meaningful  
5 basis -- is the most important part of the thing.

6 I am sorry. I over-extended my answer  
7 to you.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You said the  
9 Metropolitan Council should go ahead and in effect  
10 adopt it or follow the policy set out in the plan?

11 MR. JONES: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: How about the outside  
13 areas whom you are representing? Would that satisfy  
14 them?

15 MR. JONES: Yes.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: It would?

17 MR. JONES: We have stated so in effect  
18 -- and perhaps it was not stated explicitly here --  
19 by the County stating that it is not concerned with  
20 the continuation, which means the implementation or  
21 adoption of a Metropolitan plan. They are as concerned  
22 as anyone else with the method of its administration.  
23 That remains to be seen. I think it really will  
24 depend on what their final attitude, as anyone else  
25 in the whole area, will be as to how it is to be  
26 administered.

27 The method suggested, it seems to me,  
28 has a great deal of merit and should not cause any  
29 great concern to any part of the area. I should think  
30 it would be of even less concern if the earlier subject





1 which we were discussing vis-a-vis the Province and  
2 Metro and its relationship to the plan were implemented.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I think  
4 you have earned a ten minute recess.

5 ---SHORT RECESS

6 SUBMISSION OF THE SOUTHERN SIX MUNICIPALITIES  
7 IN THE COUNTY OF YORK

8 APPEARANCES: MR. MURRAY V. JONES, Planning Consultant  
9 MR. T. O. FRASER, Township of Vaughan  
10 MR. J. L. CATTANACH, Village of Markham

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you ready for  
12 your second instalment, Mr. Jones?

13 MR. JONES: Yes, sir, on this brief.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, I might  
15 say if you are tired, if you find it easier to sit  
16 down, I do not object.

17 MR. JONES: I am used to working on my  
18 feet so it is all right.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought it was only  
20 lawyers. I did not know it applied to planners.

21 MR. JONES: I prefer not to comment on  
22 that one.

23 In the first instance, Mr. Commissioner,  
24 the purpose of submitting this brief as distinct from  
25 the County of York brief is really based on the fact  
26 that the County brief and this brief are of a very  
27 similar nature and I could say ditto to very much  
28 of what is contained in both of them; except the  
29 County brief, as you will appreciate, had to concern  
30 itself with the direct statutory relationships that  
existed between the County and Metro that of course do







1 not exist between a portion of the County and Metro.

2 In that respect, of course, the  
3 planning relationship is directly involved with the  
4 southern six municipalities in the County and the  
5 position of the briefs vis-a-vis the boundary question,  
6 which is the other major issue, are quite synonymous.

7 I also indicate an oversight on my  
8 part, which I would like to correct for personal  
9 reasons, -- that the major part of both these briefs  
10 was prepared by Mr. MacPherson of my staff. I wanted  
11 simply to have it known that he was the principal  
12 author of these briefs.

13 The introduction I think is of some  
14 importance in that it is clearly stated that the  
15 conclusions presented in this brief do not necessarily  
16 reflect the unanimous views of all members of  
17 Council and each of the municipalities concerned.  
18 In fact the agreement reached for the preparation of  
19 the brief was based on a clear understanding that each  
20 municipality would be free to submit separate briefs  
21 if it wished to do so or that a particular municipality  
22 might support this brief in all but one or more  
23 specific aspects. I believe the next brief in your  
24 agenda conforms to this in that Richmond Hill is  
25 submitting a separate brief.

26 I am not aware whether or not any other  
27 municipality or the members of the Councils of other  
28 municipalities are present to submit as part of this  
29 brief or in relation to it any divergent views. I  
30 would like to suggest that this question might be asked





1 when I have completed because I think it was understood  
2 that it was meant as part of this presentation that  
3 they might want to express any divergent views on  
4 particular points.

5 The majority of the brief is very  
6 similar to the York County brief in that it attempts  
7 to portray what has happened in this area prior  
8 to Metro -- from Metro to today; from the beginning  
9 of Metro to now -- and it attempts to approach what  
10 may happen over the next ten years.

11 This is done for two purposes again.  
12 One is for the purpose of drawing certain conclusions  
13 and recommendations and secondly so that you might be  
14 able to do so as well. In other words, it is background  
15 information for you and in effect a research document  
16 for you in that respect.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I want to congratulate  
18 you on the information provided in both of these  
19 briefs as a preliminary to your recommendations. I  
20 found it very valuable.

21 MR. JONES: Thank you.

22 One of the other differences between  
23 this brief and the County brief is that with respect  
24 to certain services and certain relationships we have  
25 elaborated in some more detail than we did in the  
26 County brief. For instance we have dealt in Chapter 2  
27 on Growth and Change with population, employment,  
28 agriculture, trends in agricultural characteristics  
29 (quite an extensive section on that) on roads (a little  
30 more elaborated in the County brief but containing some







1 basic information) on the development of urban  
2 services, water supply and sewage disposal, including  
3 maps illustrating existing and proposed facilities  
4 of this type, storm water drainage, and then, of course,  
5 the subjects which are not raised in the County brief  
6 at all, such as police and fire protection, health  
7 and welfare services, educational facilities (which  
8 was not discussed in the County brief) and a degree  
9 of explanation of the nature of the educational system  
10 in the area and how it has developed and what it now  
11 consists of.

12 Then the planning section in this  
13 chapter is also considerably more elaborate in some  
14 details than in the County brief in that we have  
15 attempted to statistically and otherwise indicate  
16 the kind of planning activity that has been experienced  
17 in this area. And we deal with financial aspects of  
18 the area in terms of its tax base, debenture debt  
19 and so on.

20 In Chapter III we simply repeat all  
21 of these categories I have just listed in terms of  
22 the projection of growth and change in each one from  
23 1963 to 1973 and, while it might be of some interest  
24 for me to repeat certain conclusions, the fact of the  
25 matter is that they are already before you and you have  
26 already read them and unless again you have some  
27 particular questions about that chapter I do not  
28 propose to elaborate on any of those points. I would  
29 like to think that they are quite complete in themselves  
30 and do not require any elaboration.





1                   The last chapter, chapter IV is a  
2   very brief chapter simply because the main conclusion  
3   reached in terms of potential future relationships  
4   between this area and Metropolitan Toronto result  
5   in substantially the same -- in fact in almost exactly  
6   the same policy position that was expressed in the  
7   County brief.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12                   -

13  
14  
15  
16  
17                   -

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23                   -

24  
25  
26  
27  
28                   -





1 I would like very much, however, and this  
2 goes back to the question which you raised earlier  
3 with respect to an urban serviced district and I wanted  
4 to raise it in this brief for the reason that I would  
5 like to raise it by way of reading on page 50 of the  
6 brief a section called "Internal Reorganization".  
7 The brief immediately prior to this section simply  
8 puts the same argument that was raised in the County  
9 brief about change in Metropolitan boundaries.

10 It may very well be that the most needed  
11 municipal reform in this area is not so much a matter  
12 of joining or not joining the Metropolitan Corporation  
13 but one of considering internal reorganization. As  
14 noted earlier in this brief there are a number of inter-  
15 municipal arrangements for certain services. There  
16 has been a growing concern about the efficient size  
17 of municipal units and similar discussions have  
18 taken place vis-a-vis a local municipality in the  
19 County of York as have occurred between the local  
20 municipality and the Metropolitan Corporation.

21 One school of thought would transfer an  
22 increasing number of functions to the county level while  
23 another holds that the problems of the south end of  
24 the county are sufficiently different from those in  
25 the north end that centralization is not the appropriate  
26 answer.

27 In the field of education, for example,  
28 the recent decision by the government to eliminate  
29 many local school areas is indicative of the trend  
30 toward larger units of administration. It should be







1 stressed that this tendency must be balanced with what  
2 the Royal Commission on Local Government in Greater  
3 London called "The health of local government." Present-  
4 day standards of communication and transportation per-  
5 mits, and indeed behooves, some reorganization of  
6 local government administration, particularly in  
7 semi-rural areas.

8 It is conceivable, for instance, that the  
9 trend in educational consolidation could extend to  
10 the point where one school authority could administer  
11 all levels of education in the southern six municipi-  
12 palities. It is equally conceivable that fire and  
13 police services might be organized on the same basis.

14 Incidentally, the choice of words is quite  
15 precise in that there is no intent to suggest that we  
16 put forward as conceivable that this represents the  
17 actual policy as existing today. I must admit there  
18 is a growing tendency towards it possibly becoming  
19 the policy.

20 Whether such consolidation is preferable  
21 to centralization of these functions on the party level  
22 is not the principal concern of the Commission. It  
23 must be the indirect concern since the terms of  
24 reference respecting expansion of Metropolitan boundar-  
25 ies can only be properly considered as part of a  
26 general examination of alternative reorganization  
27 possibilities in the fringe area and therefore in  
28 the surrounding counties. That is the principal point  
29 that I wish to make.

30 It is submitted that the first stage of





1 potential municipal reorganization in this area ought  
2 to be one where alternative internal reorganizations  
3 are considered, and only then through that process  
4 should changed relationships with the Metropolitan  
5 Corporation be examined. Since the foregoing alter-  
6 natives have only begun to be considered by the muni-  
7 cipalities in the County of York, it is respectfully  
8 submitted that unless the terms of reference of the  
9 Commission were broadened to include an examination  
10 of alternative reorganization of wide areas surrounding  
11 Metropolitan Toronto that the Commission can come to  
12 no satisfactory conclusion with respect to changed  
13 functional relationships between the southern six  
14 municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation or  
15 its local municipalities or with respect to the  
16 extension of boundaries of the Metropolitan Corpora-  
17 tion.

18 The needs of local government in the  
19 southern six municipalities, while exhibiting wide  
20 variation, do not indicate the necessity or desira-  
21 bility of removing these municipalities from the  
22 County of York or having the urban portions annexed to  
23 the local municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto. It  
24 is even more obvious that there is no basis for the  
25 creation of a new municipality encompassing the urban  
26 portions of the southern six which could theoretically  
27 become a unit or borough -- if I may use an awkward  
28 term -- of the Metropolitan Corporation.

29 Finally, it is the view of the southern six  
30 municipalities that the priority for any contemplated







1 governmental reorganization in this area must be,  
2 first, to determine the feasibility and desirability  
3 of internal reorganization of municipalities or  
4 functions; second, to undertake the foregoing as part  
5 of the examination of the future function of the county;  
6 and third, to settle the issues arising out of the  
7 first two points as they might then relate to Metro-  
8 politan Toronto.

9           That is the end of that brief, Mr. Chairman.  
10 Might I indicate the question of the possible reorganiza-  
11 tion of both the governments in this intermediate type  
12 area might very well have considerable concern that  
13 the creation of any municipal service districts would  
14 be primarily involved with urban functions I assume,  
15 and therefore might be called urban-serviced districts.  
16 However, the trend discernible at the present time  
17 is one, as the brief indicates, of a growing sense  
18 of interdependence, a growing sense of the need to  
19 cooperate not only informally but formally in the  
20 sharing of an increasing number of services, and as  
21 against that, there is the very difficult question of  
22 the degree to which this ought to be done by way of  
23 centralizing of such functions at the county level.

24           I think it is fair to say, and I think I  
25 am interpreting the feeling of the southern six  
26 municipalities correctly, when I indicate that while  
27 the southern six municipalities have no desire to be  
28 removed from the County of York, they do feel that  
29 they do have special needs not only in each of them  
30 but interrelations with others in the same area that





1 are distinct from the province and the county, and  
2 while they have not adopted a firm policy decision  
3 on this, they are constantly increasing their degree  
4 of activity in trying to find some solutions in this  
5 respect.

6 The order of decision-making we feel is  
7 one that calls for some kind of a conclusion to re-  
8 organization in this intermediate belt which must and  
9 can only be done in terms of determination of what  
10 happens to decreasing county units, particularly of  
11 course if there is no other change but changed re-  
12 lationships between urban or semi-urban portion of  
13 the county and the balance of the county, and only  
14 through such an examination and determination can a  
15 sensible conclusion be reached as to any changed re-  
16 lationship with the major or centre of Metropolitan  
17 Toronto.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: What you are really  
19 suggesting is to the degree that the Metropolitan  
20 Corporation and the southern six municipalities are  
21 interdependent, the particular problems that arise  
22 should be met by intermunicipal arrangement? Am I  
23 interpreting you correctly?

24 MR. JONES: Only partially. In so far  
25 as interdependence with Metropolitan Toronto and the  
26 resultant aid in intermunicipal agreements -- several  
27 do exist. The most recent one that I think was  
28 mentioned in the other brief and is mentioned of course  
29 in this brief as well has to do with serving of a  
30 small portion of Markham Township with sewers, and the





1 intended serving of the Woodbridge area with sewers.  
2 That is typical of the kind of thing.

3 However, I think our conclusion on that  
4 point is that the degree to which we can visualize,  
5 based on the evidence of future growth and needs of  
6 this area vis-a-vis Metropolitan Toronto do not  
7 raise the basic question of need in our view again  
8 for direct political control; that these interdepen-  
9 dencies can be dealt with because of their rather clear-  
10 cut nature by the limited number of municipal agree-  
11 ments that may be required.

12 The main point I was making had to do with  
13 the consolidation or possible consolidation of a number  
14 of functions now being carried out by the municipali-  
15 ties themselves independent of Metropolitan Toronto.  
16 Internal consolidation and reorganization is the  
17 primary outlook of this area at the present time.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: You say that is beyond  
19 my terms of reference?

20 MR. JONES: Well, I suppose I did add  
21 "with respect".

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I appreciate that.

23 MR. JONES: It seemed to me dependent on  
24 how narrowly the Commission's terms were read, and on  
25 taking the chance that they were being read by the  
26 Commissioner or others in a narrow way, we certainly  
27 did not want to take the chance that they might be  
28 read in any other way and hedging our bets so to speak.

29 If in fact the terms of reference of the  
30 Commission do make it possible to consider the







1 implications of the nature that I have suggested, then  
2 we are not taking any position that it ought not to be  
3 done. Far from it. But it was our interpretation  
4 that the terms might not do that. We simply say that  
5 we know the terms of reference specifically refer to  
6 relationships between the Metropolitan Corporation and  
7 the area municipalities, and including municipalities  
8 within the planning area, and secondly, specific  
9 reference to the question of boundaries.

10 I fully appreciate that any consideration  
11 by this Commission with respect to the boundaries of  
12 Metropolitan Toronto in my submission must include a  
13 review of the implications in a very wide area, and it  
14 was at this point of trying to determine through our  
15 interpretation where this might evolve that led us  
16 to make this point. I personally would welcome a  
17 wider interpretation.

18 If that is the case, if I might add this,  
19 if it is the case that the terms of reference of this  
20 Commission are to examine such questions as we have  
21 raised -- apart from the boundary question -- of  
22 the reorganization of local government outside the  
23 boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto, then we would very  
24 strongly suggest that that be made, and that submissions  
25 be permitted on that point because it is certainly not  
26 understood in the area at the present time.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I do not think that was  
28 intended by the terms of reference.

29 MR. JONES: May I inquire, sir, whether  
30 or not other than the Municipality of Richmond Hill





1 which has a brief to be submitted -- in accordance with  
2 the terms under which this brief was prepared I feel  
3 responsible for trying to determine whether or not  
4 there are members of council or whole councils, whole  
5 municipalities, which do want to make a diversion  
6 simply as part of this presentation as opposed to  
7 submitting a separate brief.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I have not been advised  
9 of anybody's intention. Richmond Hill alone submitted  
10 another brief.

11 MR. JONES: My point is this: it was the  
12 feeling when this matter was being discussed locally  
13 that while I was presenting the brief because of the  
14 background to its preparation that you might permit  
15 at the time of my presentation any verbal submissions  
16 or divergent views from this brief from people in the  
17 area. That is the only point. I want to clear the  
18 slate as far as I am concerned at least.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You clear it with any-  
20 body you represent, or if anybody wants to add anything  
21 other than Richmond Hill -- I am going to hear Richmond  
22 Hill.

23 MR. FRASER: I am representing the Town-  
24 ship of Vaughan. We have no separate brief, but I  
25 would like to speak to the brief presented by Mr.  
26 Jones.

27 MR. JONES: If you have no further ques-  
28 tions of me, sir, I will sit down.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: No. Thank you. You  
30 answered a lot of questions in your first brief. I







1 hope you understand I just saved the time by putting  
2 my questions during that brief.

3 MR. JONES: Yes, I appreciate that.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, Mr. Fraser.

5 MR. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

6 Mr. Commissioner, the Township of Vaughan does agree  
7 with the brief presented to you. The council has  
8 unanimously agreed with its conclusions and recommen-  
9 dations. I have not read all of the briefs which have  
10 been presented to you, but in the reports of those  
11 briefs I have not read any what appeared to me valid  
12 arguments for extending the boundaries of the Municipi-  
13 pality of Metropolitan Toronto to include part of  
14 the Township of Vaughan.

15 Speaking particularly of the township, it  
16 has had an official plan since the year 1949 which was  
17 drastically revised in the year 1960, and it has  
18 conformed to the provisions of the draft Metropolitan  
19 official plan. The township did incorporate the whole  
20 of the area of the township as the township school  
21 area in the year 1961.

22 It is in a very sound financial position  
23 with a very bright future due to the creation of the  
24 CNR marshallings yards and the expected industry for which  
25 the township will provide services or sewer and water.  
26 We anticipate that the commercial and industrial  
27 development will increase from an existing 14.4 per  
28 cent of total assessment to 44.4 per cent in 1968.

29 The township does recognize and does agree  
30 that it should form part of the Metropolitan Toronto





1 planning area, and from a practical point of view,  
2 although there is no existing Metropolitan official  
3 plan, we find that the authorities involved do take  
4 great cognizance of the terms of the proposed official  
5 plan, and although there was as Mr. Jones mentioned a  
6 great deal of suspicion at the inception of the Metro-  
7 politan Toronto planning area from the Vaughan point  
8 of view, the relations are very sound at the moment  
9 and the two planning boards do work very well together.

10 I think there is adequate control over  
11 the development of the Township of Vaughan by virtue  
12 of existing legislation. We can see no benefit to  
13 the Township of Vaughan or to the Township of North  
14 York or Metropolitan Toronto for the extension of the  
15 boundaries to take in part of the southern part of  
16 the Township of Vaughan.

17  
18  
19 -  
20  
21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30





1 I am advised that at the time  
2 Metropolitan Toronto, or at least the Municipality  
3 of Metropolitan Toronto, did design and size the  
4 sewers to provide sewage and water for the area  
5 municipalities they were designed to service an area  
6 only up to Steeles Avenue and the small corner of  
7 the Township of Markham. If part of the Township of  
8 Vaughan is annexed to North York or does become  
9 part of Metropolitan Toronto, then they, of course,  
10 would be responsible for providing services to that  
11 annexed area, which I would assume could be done only  
12 at great expense and which would be, I submit, a  
13 burden upon the existing ratepayers in the Municipality  
14 of Metropolitan Toronto.

15 The Township does feel that it will  
16 be in a position to provide services for this area  
17 when it is ready for development. The Municipal  
18 Board and the Water Resources Commission have  
19 already approved of the construction of a sewage and  
20 water works to service the classification yard and  
21 the industrial area. As a matter of fact industry  
22 is being constructed at this very moment.

23 I really have nothing to add to that,  
24 Mr. Commissioner. If you have any questions I would  
25 be pleased to attempt to answer them.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I have no  
27 questions, Mr. Fraser. You support the submissions  
28 that Mr. Jones made?

29 MR. FRASER: Yes.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: And you are not afraid







1 of the Metropolitan Planning Board acting to the  
2 detriment of Vaughan Township?

3 MR. FRASER: No, definitely not, sir.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

5 MR. FRASER: Thank you, sir.

6 MR. J. L. CATTANACH: Mr. Commissioner,  
7 my name is J. L. Cattanach. I am representing the  
8 Village of Markham. My instructions are on behalf of  
9 the municipality to fully support the brief as  
10 submitted by Mr. Jones and to go on record to that  
11 effect this morning.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I hope you all know  
13 that I have gone through all of these municipalities.  
14 I have gone through those municipalities twice and  
15 when you make reference to certain works or roads and  
16 so on I know what you are talking about.

17 -----





SUBMISSION OF THE TOWN OF RICHMOND HILL

APPEARANCES: Thomas Broadhurst, Mayor

Mr. M. J. Bacon, Planning Consultant

THE COMMISSIONER: Is the Town of  
Richmond Hill ready?

MR. BROADHURST: Mr. Commissioner, my  
name is Broadhurst. The brief itself will be  
presented by our Planning Consultant but I wish to  
make a short preamble to it which may clarify his  
position.

THE COMMISSIONER: You are the Mayor?

MR. BROADHURST: I am Mayor, sir, yes.  
I have written it down as a defence against being  
long winded and my own poor memory.

It might help the Commission better to  
understand our brief, and assist it as to where it might  
best direct any questions, if it were to know a little  
of the background relating to its preparation and  
submittal. It is a joint submission from Council and  
Planning Board, each body being composed of seven  
members, two of whom, the Mayor and the Reeve, are  
interlocking being on both bodies.

The physical compilation of the brief  
was done by our then Planning Director who is no longer  
with us and contains certain statistics and planning  
opinions which were formulated largely by him, in  
addition to what might be termed the Brief's purely  
political content. The planning content of our Brief  
is now the responsibility of our Planning Consultants







1 and Mr. Bacon, a partner of that firm, is present and  
2 will be capable of handling questions relating to its  
3 planning content and associated statistics. The  
4 Commission should know however, that Mr. Bacon had to  
5 assume this responsibility recently and suddenly and may  
6 find himself called upon to defend opinions with which  
7 he may not be wholeheartedly in sympathy and on the  
8 background of which he may not be completely informed.

9 The Commission should also know that  
10 this Brief was prepared between the 7th of January,  
11 when this Council took office, and the 30th of January  
12 which was then the deadline for submittal of  
13 Briefs to the Commission and that no work had been done  
14 on it by the Council which preceded it. It is  
15 possible therefore that certain of our points may not  
16 be sufficiently lucidly or coherently expressed and  
17 that some of the suggestions contained in it might  
18 be susceptible to minor modifications.

19 I have in mind especially the suggestion  
20 contained in Page 5, para. 2 of our Brief which  
21 suggests that legislation be provided to permit sub-  
22 division lots registered through consent of a planning  
23 board to be deemed unregistered. We believe that it  
24 may be possible to achieve the aims which prompted  
25 this suggestion by other and less drastic methods,  
26 which Mr. Bacon will, I am sure, be glad to amplify  
27 if and when called upon to do so.

28 I am sure that the Commission will  
29 recognize that a thread of uncertainty and apprehension  
30 runs throughout our Brief. We fear the possibility





1 at least that the Provincial Government and this  
2 Commission may focus so much attention on the head  
3 and trunk of the Metropolitan Corporation, with its  
4 undeniably vast problems, that the fate of the  
5 extremities might get lost in the shuffle.

6 Our principal concerns relate to the  
7 facts (a) that the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
8 Board - a body on which we have no direct representation  
9 - has jurisdiction over us as we are a part of their  
10 planning area and (b) that extensions of the Metro-  
11 politan boundaries could have an adverse effect on our  
12 economy.

13 So far as planning control is concerned,  
14 we have to say that such control as the Metropolitan  
15 Toronto Planning Board already possesses has varied  
16 between light and zero and that if the past were an  
17 adequate guarantee for the future, we would have little  
18 cause for alarm. We have felt that the introduction  
19 of a Metropolitan Toronto Official Plan could presage  
20 a tightening of control, perhaps to our detriment from  
21 an internal economical standpoint and have recently  
22 discussed this with the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
23 Board staff.

24 In its draft form, the Metropolitan  
25 Toronto Official Plan could be construed as attempting  
26 to restrict the Town of Richmond Hill within its  
27 present confines and to permit none other than  
28 residential uses immediately adjacent to its borders.  
29 We would like some reassurance that the intention of  
30 the Official Plan is not to preclude reasonable and







1 sensible expansion by the Town of Richmond Hill, which  
2 is already to some extent bursting at the seams, and  
3 we have been assured by the Metropolitan Toronto  
4 Planning Director that he does not object to including  
5 a statement substantially along these lines in the  
6 draft plan which he will submit. We would also like  
7 to see this Commission take cognizance of this fact  
8 and perhaps to incorporate its own opinion on this  
9 subject into the Royal Commission's report.

10 To keep our economy in reasonable balance,  
11 we need considerably more industrial assessment than  
12 we presently have and for this purpose it is not  
13 sufficient to have industrial areas within reasonable  
14 access to the Town's population. There is industrial  
15 land still existing within the confines of the Town but  
16 such as there is is poorly located for the purpose, in  
17 diverse ownership of small parcels and often enough of  
18 the wrong sizes and shapes for industrial use.

19 We do not need industry purely to  
20 create jobs for our residents but also and principally  
21 to achieve a better ratio of industrial to residential  
22 assessment, to enable us to keep our heads financially  
23 above water. For this purpose, any new industry must  
24 be located within our corporate limits and if they  
25 had to be extended slightly to achieve this, we would  
26 want to feel that no reasonable extension could be  
27 arbitrarily restricted by the Metropolitan Toronto  
28 Planning Board, on which we are not directly  
29 represented.

30 Our second fear is that expansion of







1 the Metropolitan Toronto borders in areas to the south  
2 of us would remove assessment from the County of York  
3 which is most susceptible to industrial development  
4 and which therefore could be looked upon as revenue  
5 producing. This could cause us to have to pay a greatly  
6 increased share towards maintaining what was left of  
7 the County of York and what was left of the present  
8 high school districts, to which we contribute. If it  
9 were to occur, we feel that some continuing financial  
10 adjustment would have to be made to those who reap  
11 increased costs as a result of the severance, but this  
12 attitude, I think, is explained quite fully in our  
13 brief.

14 We feel that there are so many creaks  
15 and strains within the existing Metropolitan  
16 structure that its Planning Board has been and will  
17 for some time be preoccupied with problems closer to  
18 home than we are. It could be some considerable time  
19 before what was happening at the northern extremities  
20 of their planning area became a matter of immediate  
21 concern to them. However, during that time we have to  
22 exist and if the time is protracted, will have to  
23 expand.

24 We want to make sure that we are not  
25 kept in a state of suspended animation, purely because  
26 nobody is quite sure what to do with us at the present  
27 time but feels vaguely that he might want to do some-  
28 thing with us in the future. In the hiatus, we have  
29 to maintain our own economy and must have reasonable  
30 latitude to solve our problems ourselves as best we can.





1 We are aware of many of the problems of  
2 the Metropolitan corporation and appreciate that they  
3 have many others which we may not know and do not  
4 comprehend adequately. We probably have the same  
5 problems, but on a much reduced scale and do not have  
6 the comfortable reassurance that there is a buffer area  
7 surrounding us which can be left fallow until we  
8 decide what to do with it. This, of course, can force  
9 us into a need for defensive forms of annexation.

10 At the present time, the Metropolitan  
11 Corporation, through its Planning Board has authority  
12 over us, but little or no responsibility to us and  
13 this is a state of affairs which has not usually been  
14 conducive to respect for the legitimate aspirations  
15 of minorities.

16 We feel that the Commission must consider  
17 whether the authority should be extended and the  
18 responsibility increased or that the authority should  
19 be modified or withdrawn and the responsibility reduced  
20 proportionately. We feel too, that some goal should  
21 be set for eventual Metropolitan limits, because if  
22 Metropolitan Toronto does expand its boundaries, it  
23 will presumably have the same need for an adequate  
24 buffer area surrounding it.

25 This could mean that the Metropolitan  
26 Planning Area would be extended still further, and if  
27 this process were repeated often enough, we might  
28 wake up one day and find we had two Provincial  
29 Governments.

30 We hope that out of this Commission's







1 hearings will come some definition of the probably ulti-  
2 mate size and shape of the Metropolitan Corporation's  
3 limits, so that those who are within it can govern  
4 themselves accordingly and those who will be outside  
5 it can be similarly guided, but leaving as few as  
6 possible in a state of uncertainty as to what their  
7 fate might be and what they should do in the meantime.

8                   Lastly, we feel -- and feel strongly --  
9 that a compact urban municipality of nearly 20,000  
10 people should have direct representation on the body  
11 which exercises planning control over it, rather than  
12 the unsatisfactory makeshift which passes for  
13 representation at the present time. What other means  
14 are there, short of direct representation, that will  
15 enable us to know when things are being considered  
16 that might affect us drastically? As a matter of  
17 right, we feel that we should have DIRECT representation  
18 on a Board that has such powers over our planning.

19                   With your permission, sir, unless there  
20 are questions you wish to direct to me I will yield  
21 the floor to our Planning Consultant.

22                   THE COMMISSIONER: Having regard to  
23 your preliminary remarks as to what happened after  
24 the preparation of this brief you may feel free,  
25 Mr. Mayor, to withdraw any statement or recommendation  
26 that you made. This is too serious a business to  
27 allow for undue politeness.

28                   MR. BROADHURST: Yes. I think our  
29 Planning Consultant will explain those areas. It is  
30 probably as a result of being exposed to other opinions





1 which we had not encountered at that time that we  
2 had modified our approach slightly. It is more on  
3 planning matters than on political matters.

4 If I could make a personal comment,  
5 it would be that if this Commission were to eventually  
6 recommend something on the lines of what has been  
7 called a borough system for the Metropolitan  
8 Corporation and if the planning area were to continue  
9 to be substantially the same, I think it should give  
10 thought to whether or not there might be some similar  
11 borough structure in those surrounding areas, because  
12 it would appear to me, although the times may be  
13 20 or 30 years ahead, to be effective there is a need  
14 for control of it by Metro.

15 But the time to do this sort of thing  
16 is before there are a lot of services in the ground;  
17 before there are a lot of roads created, to prevent  
18 a lot of people from working haphazardly, as we  
19 have sometimes done ourselves. There is one  
20 municipality laying a sewer down one side of a main  
21 street and another municipality a few yards away  
22 laying another one. There should be some sort of  
23 voluntary cooperation, which I think is always difficult  
24 to achieve between politicians who are on varying  
25 Councils and change from year to year. There is no  
26 continuity. I think there should be some overall  
27 direction.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking  
29 about the possibility of another Metro north of  
30 Metropolitan Toronto?







1 MR. BROADHURST: Yes, sir, substantially.

2 If this were to be the structure I think what would  
3 happen north would naturally be governed by what  
4 happened to the south. But if a borough type system  
5 were to occur, if it was felt that the Metropolitan  
6 Corporation would expand into that area, we should  
7 take thought at this time as to the sort of units  
8 and the size of units that would exist in the area  
9 to which it would expand.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps before I  
11 ask any other questions it might be better for your  
12 consultant to tell me what changes you want to make  
13 in this brief. You have already mentioned one about  
14 subdivision lots registered through consent to be  
15 deemed unregistered.

16 I was going to ask a question on that.  
17 Is it Mr. Bacon?

18 MR. BROADHURST: There is one other  
19 area where I think our opinion has softened, sir,  
20 and that is on the suggestion that there would be  
21 a provincial planning authority. There is a suggestion  
22 contained in our brief for a provincial planning  
23 authority. This could not be represented as the  
24 unanimous thought of all the people who contributed  
25 to this particular brief that you have.

26 I believe that the climate of opinion  
27 would lean more towards, shall we call it, an  
28 Ontario Planning Board rather than an Ontario Municipal  
29 Board. The creation of an Ontario Planning Board  
30 to adjudicate on planning matters in the area where now







1 the Ontario Municipal Board (a non-planning authority)  
2 adjudicates -- I think that is the other main area.

3 But again I think our consultant is better qualified  
4 to explain the whys and wherefores to you.

5 MR. BACON: Sir, as the Mayor has  
6 suggested, it is a slightly difficult position in that  
7 when I was called in to put this brief before you  
8 (which is not mine) I do not think the Council or  
9 Planning Board realized that it would be possible  
10 to make substantial changes to it. It was therefore  
11 suggested that I should briefly outline what was in  
12 the brief that you have already read, sir -- and there  
13 is no need to go into any detail -- and to outline  
14 perhaps the main fears which the brief puts forward  
15 and to answer any questions that you may have.

16 Perhaps I should enlarge on one or  
17 two of the points that are in the brief -- one or  
18 two of the suggestions the Mayor has made; two of  
19 them. The first is in connection with sense and the  
20 other in connection with the representation and the  
21 Metropolitan Planning Board and the relationship of  
22 Richmond Hill to Metro and a possible provincial  
23 planning body, which did many of the things which  
24 the Ontario Municipal Board now does for planning  
25 matters.





1 I think the Mayor in his brief statement  
2 has outlined the three major areas of concern in the  
3 Town of Richmond Hill. The town has grown very sub-  
4 stantially although in comparison with many of the  
5 other municipalities in the Metropolitan area its  
6 population is still quite small. It has had a  
7 phenomenally fast growth rate, and the majority of this  
8 growth has been in residential population and has not  
9 been followed by substantial increase in its industrial  
10 base or its commercial assessment so that it is a  
11 problem which has been comparatively great in the past  
12 and it is likely to be even greater in the future.  
13 This is not through the substantial increase in the  
14 existing population except in terms of the number of  
15 school children which are a result of the natural  
16 increase thereof and the change from the public school  
17 system and separate school system to the high schools.

18 The estimate is that the need in Richmond  
19 Hill will be for some \$13 million of additional indus-  
20 trial assessment in the next few years, which is very  
21 substantial, and as the figures given in detail in the  
22 brief suggest it is almost impossible to think that  
23 Richmond Hill can achieve this.

24 It therefore has to be exceedingly prudent  
25 in its future actions in terms of residential expan-  
26 sion, yet there is no indication that there is a  
27 diminution in the rate at which developers want to  
28 develop in the municipality and people want to live  
29 in the municipality.

30 I think this is so because it is a rather







1 pleasant place to live; it is not too far from Metro-  
2 politan Toronto, and it can, as the official plan  
3 suggests, enjoy cultural and other advantages of  
4 being in the Metropolitan region and still living out-  
5 side, very close to rural surroundings, and still get  
6 some of the advantages of the small town, so that it  
7 has a number of very considerable advantages. However,  
8 it is most concerned with this problem of finances and  
9 taxation.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Since the brief says  
11 that Richmond Hill has very little land left within  
12 its present confines, do I have to assume when you talk  
13 of industrial development that you are thinking in terms  
14 of annexation of the surrounding area?

15 MR. BACON: Yes, sir. This is a thought  
16 which the municipality has had. It has not formulated  
17 any definite plan in this connection, but it realizes  
18 in order to gain additional assessment it will almost  
19 certainly have to annex. Its fear has been that it  
20 will be restricted by the actions of the Metropolitan  
21 Planning Board and Council if it adopts the draft  
22 plan.

23 We have presented a brief to the Metropoli-  
24 tan Planning Board as late as yesterday which I did  
25 prepare. We have had fairly extensive discussions  
26 with Mr. Comay and Mr. Bower in the Land Use Division  
27 of the Metropolitan Planning Board. They have, as  
28 the Mayor suggested, agreed substantially to the re-  
29 quests which the Municipality of Richmond Hill made.

30 The first of them was that there should be





1 a statement included in the Metropolitan official plan  
2 that the reasonable aspirations in terms of boundary  
3 changes or expansion of Richmond Hill were not auto-  
4 matically thwarted or would not be automatically  
5 thwarted by the proposed Metropolitan official plan.

6 We would be happy I am sure to submit to  
7 you, sir, the brief which we have submitted to the  
8 Metropolitan Planning Board, and this may cover a  
9 number of the points which are concerned in this brief  
10 too. The exact statement which was suggested was  
11 that there would be no intent in this plan, referring  
12 to the Metropolitan official plan, to restrict the  
13 town to its present boundaries or inhibit its efforts  
14 to improve its financial or assessment position.

15 I think this is the first and a serious  
16 point which the municipality has made that it must im-  
17 prove its financial position, and that Metropolitan  
18 Toronto by the official plan as it now stands, or the  
19 proposed plan as it now stands, may inhibit these  
20 efforts. There is assurance from the staff that this  
21 is a reasonable request, and the town wishes to urge  
22 upon you, sir, that you will also consider this, and  
23 I am sure it is not exactly possible but should give  
24 some added weight to this recommendation from the  
25 Richmond Hill municipality.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's assume that you  
27 did get \$13 million additional industrial assessment.  
28 Would you be able to provide all the workers from the  
29 present residents of Richmond Hill or would you  
30 attract workers from outside?





1 MR. BACON: I think, sir, with the greatest  
2 respect this is a question almost impossible to answer  
3 because there is such a mobility of workers within the  
4 Metropolitan area. This is indeed one of its prin-  
5 cipal advantages or a principal advantage of any  
6 metropolitan area, that it provides great flexibility.

7 While at the present time the inhabitants  
8 of Richmond Hill largely go down into Metropolitan  
9 Toronto to work, I think from my experience it is quite  
10 probable if Richmond Hill had a very sizeable indus-  
11 trial base, a number of people working there would come  
12 from Metropolitan Toronto.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: But if you had to  
14 attract workers from outside, you would face the problem  
15 of housing and additional school costs, would you not?

16 MR. BACON: I don't think necessarily so,  
17 no.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, you  
19 would restrict entry to bachelors or people without  
20 children?

21 MR. BACON: No, but within the present  
22 municipal boundaries of course there is, as we say,  
23 comparatively little room in which the residential  
24 population can expand except within the natural  
25 increase of the houses there now.

26 If the municipality did not expand for  
27 other than industrial land, it would not have room to  
28 have these people so that they would almost certainly  
29 have to go under present circumstances into Metropolitan  
30 Toronto.







1                   Now, the draft Metropolitan official plan  
2 suggests there will be a sewage treatment plant west  
3 of Yonge Street, south of the town. I am sure you  
4 are aware of this proposition. If this was the case  
5 it may well be that some adjustment to Richmond Hill's  
6 boundaries may be advisable in order that they, as  
7 a municipal unit, could cope with some of this urban  
8 population. It may be the exact location of the sewage  
9 plant would be modified. There have been a number of  
10 discussions and studies of this problem, and no definite  
11 conclusion has been reached. All that Richmond Hill  
12 is now urging since it has no definite plans finalized  
13 is that no stop would be put on in fact so that it  
14 can't move in any direction.

15                   It wants any reasonable and well-worked  
16 out programme of its development, any bettering of its  
17 assessment ratio to be allowable and approved by  
18 Metropolitan Toronto who will exercise its jurisdiction  
19 in terms of land use. A very large portion of this  
20 brief, therefore, deals with this whole problem, and it  
21 brings us immediately to the question of representation  
22 on the Metropolitan Planning Board, which is a serious  
23 one for Richmond Hill in their view, in that they are  
24 substantially unlike the adjacent municipalities in  
25 that they are almost entirely an urban municipality  
26 whereas the other municipalities which are represented  
27 with them on the Metropolitan Planning Board are sub-  
28 stantially rural.

29                   They feel quite strongly that they should  
30 have direct representation on the Board. They have





1 made this submission to a number of people including  
2 the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, and again  
3 they have mentioned this in the brief, in the comments  
4 they have just put forward to the Board, and have urged  
5 that this representation be afforded to them, sir.

6 I think they have an understandable fear  
7 which the Mayor expressed, but qualified to some extent  
8 by saying in the past the actions of the Metropolitan  
9 Planning Board have in fact been quite small or almost  
10 zero in respect to Richmond Hill. Perhaps this in  
11 some way has been a mixed blessing because it may be  
12 that the substantial growth of Richmond Hill and the  
13 benefits of it could be argued in view of its impending  
14 or present taxation problem.

15 However, it is in the future it is fearful  
16 that without direct representation and without a direct  
17 voice on the Board it has almost two strikes against it.  
18 First of all, it can't make its voice known on the  
19 Board and secondly, a plan would have to be adopted  
20 by Council so it is not represented at all even by  
21 joint representation, and this is an additional problem  
22 which they fear, and I would like to say a few words  
23 on it in a few minutes, sir.

24 There is also the question of the possibility  
25 that under the present Metropolitan Act it is impos-  
26 sible for Metropolitan Toronto to give any financial  
27 assistance to a municipality such as Richmond Hill  
28 which is in effect at the present time a dormitory  
29 suburb.

30 The municipality suggests since a very







1 large proportion of its workers work in Metropolitan  
2 Toronto and the firms there pay taxes which educate the  
3 children in Metropolitan Toronto, there should be some  
4 means by which they can be compensated for the large  
5 number of children which Richmond Hill has to educate.  
6 The brief gives some statistics on the number of  
7 children, as you will see, and it has the largest in  
8 Metropolitan Toronto. The largest number of children  
9 per family.

10 This whole question is mentioned briefly  
11 in the draft Metropolitan official plan which suggests  
12 in part (1) there should be some financial adjustment  
13 possible within the Metropolitan planning area and  
14 the fringe areas outside Metropolitan Toronto itself.  
15 Richmond Hill heartily supports this statement in the  
16 plan, and urges that this be one of your recommenda-  
17 tions.

18 It not only suggests this should be on a  
19 one-shot basis, but on a continuing basis as long as  
20 the balance which exists, with Richmond Hill being quite  
21 a substantial dormitory town continues, and provided  
22 of course there are reasonable safeguards built in  
23 for both sides.

24 This brings us, sir, to the possibility  
25 that Metropolitan Toronto would expand. As you have  
26 said, there are one or two briefs which have suggested  
27 that the Metropolitan political area, the municipality,  
28 should expand, and in this case the Town of Richmond  
29 Hill feels that the thing of utmost importance, of  
30 course, is the financial problem which would accrue in





1 the absence of any definite propositions that the  
2 town knew of, it was impossible to come to any  
3 definite conclusions as to how this might be worked  
4 out and exactly what the effect on the town might be.

5 It therefore must content itself with  
6 making the general statement that if there is an ex-  
7 pansion of the Metropolitan boundary which would remove  
8 existing and certainly potential non-residential assess-  
9 ment in the vicinity of the new marshalling yards,  
10 then some financial compensation would be probably  
11 vitally needed, and even more, some reasonable compen-  
12 sation on a continuing basis is necessary now.

13 In the brief, sir, the question of the  
14 degree of control by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
15 Board and the effect that the proposed official plan  
16 might have on the town -- I have mentioned the salient  
17 points with which the town is concerned. There is a  
18 reference in the brief to the vagueness of the present  
19 Metropolitan Toronto official plan proposed, and  
20 suggests that there should be, as Richmond Hill in  
21 the past has suggested, a district plan produced by  
22 the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

23 There are differing opinions on this. My  
24 own view is, and I think it would be fair to put this  
25 forward at this time, that the Metropolitan Toronto  
26 Planning Board tried one district plan and they were  
27 largely the authors of it (District 10) and the results  
28 have perhaps been a little mixed because it was not  
29 North York's plan. It was basically a plan prepared  
30 by Metropolitan Toronto in cooperation with North York.





1 I think it is better for the municipalities  
2 themselves, if they are capable of it, to produce a  
3 plan with assistance from Metropolitan Toronto who have,  
4 of course, the basic statistical background and the  
5 technical people to do it. Therefore there are two  
6 sides to this. I think certainly it is absolutely  
7 essential that detailed plans, more detailed than the  
8 Metropolitan official plan proposed should be worked  
9 out for an area such as Richmond Hill, and if they  
10 are not, the basic controls or proposals in them are  
11 not sufficient to adequately guide the municipality  
12 in the right direction.

13 The next point in connection with the plan,  
14 of course, is the suggestion in the plan that urban  
15 development in the townships adjacent to Richmond Hill  
16 should be curtailed. The brief suggests that this  
17 may be rather difficult, and that past experience in  
18 connection with a proposed plan of subdivision which  
19 was not approved by the Minister and which was sub-  
20 sequently attempted to be registered as individual  
21 lots by consent of the Planning Board, and then stopped  
22 by the health unit, is not really an adequate way in  
23 which to deal with the problem.

24 The Mayor suggested that I have a number  
25 of other solutions which might be applied to this, but  
26 I think perhaps I would be forestalled if the Bill  
27 which is now before the House is passed which deals  
28 with this whole problem and proposes to transfer the  
29 power to grant consents from the Planning Board to  
30 the Committee of Adjustments. It was in something







1 along these lines that are automatically embodied in  
2 this Bill that my suggestions lay.

3 Basically I think if you tried to deregister  
4 or unregister lots which have been consented to by the  
5 Planning Board generally speaking those lots are only  
6 consented to and registered if they are actually going  
7 to be built upon. This is not always true of sub-  
8 division, so there is a very definite difference between  
9 the two, and if one does deregister them, one is perhaps  
10 locking the stable door after the horse has gone be-  
11 cause the house is there. There may be a slight  
12 distinction in this in that you may get very large  
13 lots which you do want registered by consent, which  
14 you want to register in order to replot the whole area  
15 or resubdivide the whole area. This may be done by  
16 a judge's order, or there may be adequate ways of  
17 doing this.

18 The central problem with which the town  
19 is concerned is the question of unbridled expansion  
20 by consent which would not require the approval of  
21 the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and other means  
22 with which the Planning Board had managed to control  
23 urban development in the past.

24 I think there has been a reasonable degree  
25 of control by the municipalities in the fringe areas  
26 with some exceptions in the past ten years, and I  
27 think one can hope they will go on so that the urban  
28 problem won't continue, but I think there should be  
29 safeguards in that there should be avenues of appeal.

30 The suggestion I would make is that the





1 Metropolitan Planning Board, other than through Minutes  
2 of the individual planning boards which have been sub-  
3 mitted to them, should be supplied with a list similar  
4 to the municipal list yearly on a quarterly basis of  
5 all consents given, and what those consents are for.  
6 I think administratively this would be a very small  
7 thing to do. The Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board  
8 could then review it and if Richmond Hill had direct  
9 representation on the Board, I think they could say  
10 we think there is a problem in this area surrounding  
11 us, and something should be done about it.

12 In order that something could be done  
13 about it, something positive, there should be some  
14 appeal possible by the Metropolitan Planning Board  
15 of any consent which was given within a specific time  
16 along the lines of the Committee of Adjustment appeal  
17 within fourteen days.

18  
19 -  
20  
21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30







1 Now in fact if the Act which is  
2 presented before the House is approved this appeal  
3 will automatically be built in because any decision  
4 of the Committee of Adjustments with respect to  
5 consents can be appealed and in fact could be appealed  
6 by Richmond Hill, as I read the legislation -- and I  
7 only read it this morning before coming into this  
8 hearing. So I think this problem is perhaps already  
9 taken care of if the Act is approved. But if the Act  
10 is not passed I think some avenue of appeal to stop  
11 this consent may be a very important point because  
12 it could not only be for residential construction but  
13 industrial development and could successfully thwart  
14 several parts of the Metropolitan Official Plan, which  
15 states that no new large concentrations of industrial  
16 developments should be permitted. There is no way  
17 of stopping them under the present plan where a  
18 variety of uses are allowed in a rural area and would  
19 conform to the Official Plan.

20 The next point which is raised, sir,  
21 is the question of a Board of Arbitration if you are  
22 in any conflict which arises between Metropolitan  
23 Toronto Planning Board or Metropolitan Toronto  
24 Corporation and the Town of Richmond Hill or any  
25 other municipality, but particularly the Town of  
26 Richmond Hill with which we are concerned. It is  
27 suggested that the Ontario Municipal Board is not a  
28 planning body and should therefore not deal with these  
29 specific planning problems. The suggestion is that  
30 there should be something like a provincial planning





1 authority or provincial planning board to deal with  
2 these specific planning problems in that they would  
3 have a planning staff.

4 I think the suggestion has some merit  
5 but I do not incline altogether to it myself. My  
6 experience with the Municipal Board has been that  
7 it is a pretty darn good body (to put it crudely, sir)  
8 and our experience has been that where they have  
9 rapped knuckles it has been for reasonably justifiable  
10 reasons.

11 There are many ways in which this  
12 problem, I think, could be tackled and if I may refer  
13 to one of your questions to Mr. Jones this morning  
14 in which you asked him "Were the powers conferred to  
15 the Metropolitan Act sufficient?", I would incline  
16 to the view, sir, that they would be sufficient if  
17 there was perhaps closer cooperation or closer integra-  
18 tion between all levels of the provincial government  
19 and the metropolitan government in that it is not  
20 only sewage and water that controls urbanization but  
21 it is also the policies in respect to hydro rates,  
22 to health, to educational grounds, to small schools in  
23 rural areas, to subsidies on roads and bridges in  
24 rural areas and a dozen other different ways in which  
25 the provincial government oversees, guides, controls  
26 or what-have-you the affairs of the municipalities.

27 If all of these are coordinated to  
28 produce the results suggested in the Metropolitan  
29 Toronto Official Plan, and, to give a good example,  
30 supposing by consent an urban area in fact developed







1 in the middle of a Township; it would be possible  
2 as soon as this phenomenon became apparent for the  
3 Department of Education to say: "You have these  
4 children here and they therefore must be educated but  
5 we will not give grants for a continuing or an  
6 increase in this phenomenon." I think this would be  
7 a very effective way of stopping it and assisting the  
8 whole implementation of the Metropolitan Official  
9 Plan, and I think a perfectly reasonable way of  
10 implementing it -- because it is, after all, public  
11 money that is being spent in this regard -- and if  
12 a plan has been adopted with direct representation  
13 on the Metro Planning Board of the people who are  
14 affected by it, this fairly tight control would be  
15 quite reasonable. I could enlarge on that, but I  
16 will not, sir, for the moment.

17 I think those are the major points  
18 of the brief, sir. I will be very happy to answer  
19 any questions on that if you have any.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I have no questions,  
21 thank you.

22 Have you anything else, Mayor  
23 Broadhurst?

24 MR. BROADHURST: No, thank you, sir.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much  
26 for your presentation.

27 I now adjourn until Tuesday morning  
28 at ten o'clock.

29  
30 ---WHEREUPON THE HEARING WAS ADJOURNED UNTIL TUESDAY,  
THE 12th DAY OF MAY, 1964 AT 10:00 A.M.





ON

VOLUME No. 1

## OFFICIAL REPORTERS





ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Tuesday, May 12th,  
1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.  
et seq.

PRESENT:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
F. H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant







INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
TOWNSHIP OF PICKERING and PICKERING TOWNSHIP SCHOOL AREA No.2 and COMBINED BRIEF PICKERING TOWNSHIP and SCHOOL AREA NO. 2	908 - 938
THE TOWN OF AJAX	939 - 950
THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO	951 - 975
METROPOLITAN TORONTO AND REGION CONSERVATION AUTHORITY	976 - 987

\* \* \* \* \*





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Pickering Township  
2 and Board of Trustees and School Area No. 2. I  
3 gather that one brief will be presented for the two  
4 bodies; is that right?

5 MR. LAYCOX: That is right, Mr. Commissioner.

6  
7 SUBMISSION OF  
8 TOWNSHIP OF PICKERING  
9 and  
10 PICKERING TOWNSHIP SCHOOL AREA NO. 2  
11 and  
12 COMBINED BRIEF PICKERING TOWNSHIP  
13 AND SCHOOL AREA No. 2

---

14 Appearances:

15 Mr. C. W. Laycox	Reeve of Pickering Township
16 Mr. J. H. Adamson	Chairman, School Board, School Area No. 2

---

17  
18 MR. ADAMSON: Mr. Chairman, my name is  
19 Jim Adamson and I am chairman of the Public School Board  
20 in Pickering, School Area No. 2. This Board has asked  
21 me to present their brief to you on their behalf.

22 This Board administers the largest school  
23 system in Pickering Township, and I have been fortunate  
24 enough to have served as Chairman on it for the past  
25 two and a half years.

26 We have been concerned about the relatively  
27 high mill rate for public schools in our area for some  
28 time. In December, 1962, a financial study was under-  
29 taken to see why this was so, and to determine likely  
30 trends. Before we begin our presentation to you today





1 a short account of what happened as a result of this  
2 study might be of interest to you.

3 After completing a comparison of our  
4 c o s t s with the Ontario averages, we arranged for  
5 an informal meeting with trustees from nearby municipi-  
6 palities bordering Metro. At this meeting which was  
7 in May of 1963 information on costs and assessments  
8 were exchanged enabling us to present a brief in  
9 July of 1963 to the Minister of Education.

10 Our objective in this was to ensure that  
11 the Minister had a full picture of our financial pro-  
12 blems before the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan became  
13 legislation. This brief was received by the Deputy  
14 Minister, and the then Reeve of Pickering Township,  
15 Mr. Sherman Scott, supported us in our presentation.

16 I am most pleased that today our present  
17 Reeve Mr. Laycox is with me. Mr. Laycox, along with  
18 members of township council and our school board have  
19 worked in close cooperation to make it possible to  
20 bring to you a combined brief from both of us. This  
21 combined brief in the black cover differs from the  
22 separate brief only in the fact that the information  
23 is coordinated. The contents are essentially the same.  
24 The fact that the school board and the township are  
25 united in its approach to you demonstrates in itself  
26 the seriousness of the situation which is facing us.

27 One further introductory comment: we have  
28 had some illustrative material prepared to use in our  
29 presentation in the belief that we should do our best  
30 on behalf of the taxpayers in the area to describe our







1 position as clearly as possible. Our plan is to have  
2 Mr. Laycox and I speak alternately and to use as our  
3 basis a summary of the two briefs which were sent to  
4 you separately. If you are in agreement with this  
5 procedure, Mr. Commissioner, I would like to have Mr.  
6 Laycox continue with our presentation at this point.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

8 MR. LAYCOX: I would add my thanks to  
9 those of Mr. Adamson for your seeing fit to allow us  
10 to present our brief jointly.

11 The Township of Pickering has an area of  
12 70,712 acres commencing at the north shore of Lake  
13 Ontario and extending northerly some fourteen miles  
14 along the eastern limit of Metropolitan Toronto and  
15 the Township of Markham, with a frontage of nine miles  
16 on Lake Ontario.

17 Pickering forms the largest and most  
18 populated township in the County of Ontario, with com-  
19 plete full-time municipal staff to augment policies  
20 and directions of the elected representatives.

21 Within the boundaries of the township are  
22 located self-administered municipalities, namely the  
23 Village of Pickering and the Town of Ajax. The  
24 population of the township is 21,891 persons, having  
25 22 public schools, 3 high schools and a total pupil  
26 attendance of 4,484.

27 In relation to adjacent municipalities you  
28 will note that the township is considerably larger,  
29 and as a result possibly somewhat more unwieldy to  
30 administer. However, geographically, socially,





1 culturally and educationally we are more than closely  
2 related to our neighbours.

3 MR. ADAMSON: The bulk of the population  
4 of Pickering Township is concentrated in School Area  
5 No. 2 and in the villages of Claremont, Brougham,  
6 Whitevale and Greenwood. School Area No. 2 abuts  
7 Metro and is the main urban area. It has a population  
8 of 15,000, approximately, which is 72 per cent of the  
9 total population in the township. It occupies  
10 about 15 per cent of the total land area, and we  
11 have a public school student enrolment of 2,933 as  
12 of last year.

13 An official plan covering probable future  
14 trends was completed in 1962, and the township retained  
15 Project Planning Associates. This was confirmed by  
16 a Metro Toronto planning study, and the result of this  
17 is by 1980 it is expected there will be 50,000 people  
18 residing in School Area No. 2. In 1963 you recall  
19 our student enrolment was 2,933 in eight public schools  
20 in the area, and by 1980 there will be nearly 10,000  
21 school children if the predicted increase takes place.

22 This will result in increased building for  
23 new schools amounting to approximately one every two  
24 years. This growth rate would require expansion and  
25 improvement of municipal services as well.

26 Now, in looking at costs for our pupils  
27 and for our schools generally, we felt it was best to  
28 have these worked out on a per pupil basis in order  
29 to compare them with some of the information that we  
30 had available. This comparative data which is on







1 this chart over here (indicating) shows that for  
2 instruction, administration and plant maintenance  
3 our costs compare favourably with Ontario averages  
4 for school systems having about the same size as ours.  
5 However, there are some costs on which the situation  
6 is very different. Plant operation, for example, is  
7 higher due to the direct influence of Metro. Our  
8 caretakers' rates of pay are now negotiated with the  
9 Canadian Union of Public Employees, and these reflect  
10 Metro trends.

11 Our transportation problems are unique  
12 we think because our area is divided not only by high-  
13 way 401 but also by two CNR lines, the main line to  
14 Toronto and the new bypass freight line, and the  
15 result is higher transportation costs.

16 Again the Metro impact is felt in debenture  
17 debt charges. The population growth has forced  
18 much new construction during the past eight years, and  
19 this growth is continuing as predicted by the planners  
20 as there is an influx of people from the Metro area.  
21 New school construction continues. As construction  
22 workers get the Metro rates in this area, costs com-  
23 pare to Metro, although by being careful in design,  
24 we have kept our square foot costs down, we think.  
25 In our last bids, for example, school construction  
26 costs were just under \$13 a square foot.

27 In summary then for items which are under  
28 the direct control of the school board such as in-  
29 struction and administration and maintenance costs, they  
30 are in line with the Ontario averages, but for those





1 costs on which the Metro influence is paramount, the  
2 costs are higher. In the overall picture our gross  
3 cost per pupil is about 20 per cent less than for a  
4 comparable Metro municipality. We have some other  
5 financial statistics which Mr. Laycox will talk about  
6 a little better than I.

7 MR. LAYCOX: Mr. Commissioner, I would  
8 dwell for just a moment on municipal services as they  
9 exist at the present time. They are capable only of  
10 handling the residential area for which they were  
11 designed as well as the proposed industrial part to  
12 the east. Those services were initially designed  
13 by the developer to handle what is known as Bay Ridges  
14 Area, and since their advent it has been increasingly  
15 difficult to avoid installation of services in other  
16 needy areas. We are at the present time considering  
17 the advisability of a concerted and costly study from  
18 an engineering standpoint where we can go and how  
19 soon. To expand at all from the present area will  
20 require an enlargement of the existing plans at con-  
21 siderable cost. Our inability to expand these ser-  
22 vices is, as you realize, due to the lack of industrial  
23 and commercial assessment.

24 May I point out, Mr. Commissioner, that our  
25 financial statistics for the years 1959 to 1962  
26 inclusive show that our school enrolment figures in-  
27 creased by 44 per cent, our gross costs increased by  
28 77 per cent, and capital expenditures showed an in-  
29 crease of 79 per cent during those years. In 1963  
30 the average attendance increased by about 50 per cent.







1                   However, lower and revised assessment has  
2                   created an ever-widening gap between costs and  
3                   assessment.       In that year assessment per pupil  
4                   dropped from a high of \$5,810 to \$5,550.       Provincially,  
5                   the accepted, and I may say the ideal ratio of assess-  
6                   ment per pupil is approximately \$10,000 to \$12,000.  
7                   Our neighbouring municipality of Scarborough has  
8                   staggering ratio of about \$36,000 per pupil.

9                   May I say at this juncture, Mr. Commissioner,  
10                  I think the figures appear to us to be in a very fancy  
11                  neighbourhood for us to be struggling alongside of. The  
12                  sad lack, and I stress this fact, of commercial and  
13                  industrial assessment is here again emphasized, and I  
14                  believe you will agree that we are pinched.

15                 MR. ADAMSON:   At this point, Mr. Commis-  
16                 sioner, I would like to draw your attention to some  
17                 of the statistics which are given in our brief.

18                 THE COMMISSIONER:   I want to go back to  
19                 one question.   When you spoke of the assessment per  
20                 pupil, were you talking of public elementary schools  
21                 or secondary schools?

22                 MR. LAYCOX:   Public elementary schools.

23                 THE COMMISSIONER:   Well, the Scarborough  
24                 figure for public elementary is \$9,500.   The Scarborough  
25                 figure for secondary is \$36,000.

26                 MR. LAYCOX:   My apologies, sir.

27                 THE COMMISSIONER:   So Scarborough has  
28                 problems too.

29                 MR. LAYCOX:   Quite obviously.

30                 MR. ADAMSON:   While we are talking about







1 percentage increases of gross costs I would like to  
2 draw your attention to some of the figures that we have  
3 on the table which is on page 8 of the brief in the  
4 black cover or page 5 of the original brief that the  
5 School Board sent in. It is the same table in both  
6 cases.

7 In particular, while gross costs are up  
8 77 per cent worked out as per pupil on average daily  
9 attendance basis, the gross cost increase is only 8  
10 per cent over this five-year period.

11 Further down in the table under Item No. 8,  
12 the cost of instruction and supplies per pupil  
13 increased only 2 per cent. We submit, therefore,  
14 that in relation to the controllable and instructional  
15 items the administration has been consistently economi-  
16 cal. The great problem appears to be the Metro  
17 influence on other costs and on the tax base from  
18 which our educational dollar must be raised.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: In the tables to which  
20 you refer you show an increase of 3 per cent in in-  
21 struction and supplies per pupil. Does instruction  
22 include teachers' salaries?

23 MR. ADAMSON: Yes, that would include  
24 teachers' salaries.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: What does No. 7 mean,  
26 instruction supplies, 69 per cent increase?

27 MR. ADAMSON: That was the actual per-  
28 centage increase over the period. In other words,  
29 while supplies went up 69 per cent, the overall pic-  
30 ture of instruction and supplies per pupil went up





1 only 3 per cent.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you find it diffi-  
3 cult to get teachers for your schools?

4 MR. ADAMSON: This has been quite a problem  
5 and continues to be a problem. We thought at one time  
6 that it had been solved. There were lots of things  
7 in the press that said many people were going into  
8 teaching, but we find we have to look pretty hard  
9 to get teachers, and we use a lot of Teacher College  
10 graduates in our area.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: How does your scale  
12 of teachers' salaries compare with the Metro scale?

13 MR. ADAMSON: For some time it has been  
14 approaching this, and last year when we settled with  
15 the teachers we settled for a salary scale that was  
16 to all intents and purposes the same as Scarborough's.  
17 This seemed to be the only way in which we could ensure  
18 we could get teachers to come to our area.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you find you can  
20 retain the teachers once they come, or is there a  
21 high rate of turnover?

22 MR. ADAMSON: Well, I wouldn't like to  
23 compare the rate of turnover exactly. All I can say  
24 is that we do have a lot of teachers who seem to stay  
25 with us quite a bit. The size of the system appeals  
26 to them. Perhaps if you would like some figures on  
27 how this turns out, we would be glad to dig them up  
28 for you. This would be useful.

29

30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it would.

2 MR. ADAMSON: I will make a note to supply  
3 some figures on that.

4 Mr. Laycox, I think you want to talk about  
5 taxes.

6 MR. LAYCOX: May I point out, Mr. Commis-  
7 sioner, that on our next visual aid the widespread  
8 mill rate between the Municipality of Metropolitan  
9 Toronto and the Township of Pickering, the 1963 tax  
10 levy for municipal educational purposes in Metro was  
11 18.76 mills while in Pickering T.S.A. No. 2 it was  
12 34 mills.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: What Metro municipality  
14 are you citing?

15 MR. LAYCOX: The local municipalities of  
16 the Metropolitan area, sir.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: But there was not the  
18 same rate in all municipalities?

19 MR. LAYCOX: No. This is an average rate,  
20 sir.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I see, and you are  
22 comparing that average of 18.76 mills with?

23 MR. LAYCOX: With our ---

24 THE COMMISSIONER: With a 34 mill rate in  
25 Pickering?

26 MR. LAYCOX: Yes, sir.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Can you compare the  
28 assessments? Is property assessed on the same basis?

29 MR. LAYCOX: We would like to think it is,  
30 sir. But whether the manual is being used to the same





1 extent in Metro Toronto as it is in Pickering or vice  
2 versa, we cannot be sure.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You are using the  
4 Provincial Manual?

5 MR. LAYCOX: Yes, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Metro does not use the  
7 Provincial Manual. Metro has an equalized assessment  
8 made by the Assessment Commissioner and you do not know  
9 whether a house assessed at 5,000 in Metro would also  
10 be assessed at 5,000 in Pickering? You do not know  
11 that?

12 MR. LAYCOX: I do not have the figures with  
13 me, sir, but, as Mr. Adamson suggests, I will be only  
14 too happy to dig them up and supply you with them.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Because you know that  
16 comparing mill rates does not mean anything if the  
17 assessment basis is different.

18 MR. LAYCOX: I realize that.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: If properties in Picker-  
20 ing -- and I am not saying this happens -- but if pro-  
21 perties are assessed at 50 per cent of what they would  
22 be assessed in Metropolitan Toronto you would expect  
23 the mill rate to be double?

24 MR. LAYCOX: Yes. We are assessed under  
25 equalized assessment, of course, at roughly 30 per  
26 cent of value.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Value in what year?

28 MR. LAYCOX: Equalized assessment as of  
29 1962.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: I will have those





1 figures, the assessment bases, checked by my own staff.

2 MR. LAYCOX: Thank you, sir. In Metro  
3 all the figures that we have used here, Mr. Commissioner,  
4 of one mill levy produced approximately \$25 educational  
5 revenue while in Pickering a one mill levy produces  
6 approximately \$9.50 educational revenue.

7 The total tax rate in Pickering Township  
8 school area No. 2 is residential 87.4 mills and  
9 commercial 94 mills. These rates are considerably  
10 in excess of some rates which have been quoted recent-  
11 ly by other municipalities and have appeared to us the  
12 least appalling. For example, when a rate of  
13 approximately 71 mills was struck in Toronto recently  
14 all and sundry felt this was the ultimate end.

15 A very recent survey shows that 87 per  
16 cent of the residents of the municipality, of the  
17 Township of Pickering, derive their income from Metro  
18 Toronto industry and commerce and a percentage of the  
19 remainder from the Oshawa, Whitby and Ajax areas.  
20 Our educational tax source was from residential  
21 assessment to the Town of 88 per cent and a mere 12  
22 per cent from existing industrial assessment.

23 The area then must be considered a dormi-  
24 tory community for the larger areas to the east and  
25 west.

26 Pickering Township is under the control  
27 and administration of the Metropolitan Planning Board.  
28 A need for water and sanitary services for East  
29 Scarborough, Markham and Uxbridge townships can  
30 probably best be made by installations in Pickering







1 Township on the lake front. These land areas are  
2 naturally orientated to the Pickering Township water-  
3 sheds in Lake Ontario within the township boundaries.  
4 Pickering Township has available the only lakefront  
5 property for industrial and power development in the  
6 eastern Metropolitan Toronto region.

7 MR. ADAMSON: These items we are mention-  
8 ing at this point were items which we included in our  
9 section 3 of the School Board brief, and they were  
10 implemented by the addition of some information from  
11 the township. So in the black covered brief you  
12 can follow them along perhaps -- if you would like to  
13 do it this way.

14 The next one is on page 18 in the black  
15 covered brief, section 3.7, which states that education-  
16 al costs of instruction, operation, maintenance and  
17 construction are equivalent to Metropolitan Toronto.  
18 This area is in the Metropolitan Toronto region as  
19 designated by the Toronto Labour Council.

20 MR. LAYCOX: Mr. Commissioner, 90 per cent  
21 of Pickering Township east of the Duffin's Creek  
22 watershed lies within the jurisdiction of the Metro-  
23 politan Toronto Region and Conservation Authority.  
24 It is imperative that adequate recreational and  
25 conservation areas be provided for the large Metro-  
26 politan area. This fact underlines the interdependency  
27 of the entire Metropolitan region and is supported by  
28 1964 Metropolitan Planning Board proposals as evidenced  
29 in their Official Plan.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you satisfied with





1 the operations of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
2 Board in so far as Pickering Township is concerned?

3 MR. LAYCOX: Yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: And you would want to  
5 continue under the Planning Board jurisdiction?

6 MR. LAYCOX: I would think so, Mr. Commis-  
7 sioner. They are a little restrictive as far as we  
8 are concerned, but definitely I think they have been  
9 the leaders in planning and certainly have helped us  
10 along in many ways.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You do not feel that  
12 their planning has restricted development in Pickering  
13 unduly?

14 MR. LAYCOX: Not unduly, Mr. Commissioner,  
15 but it has tended to restrict in some areas, things  
16 that possibly our own planning consultants within  
17 those areas would not have considered -- for instance,  
18 lake front development. Whether we are going to be  
19 allowed to develop at the lake front in the future is  
20 difficult to say at this time.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are prepared  
22 to rely on the Metropolitan Planning Board?

23 MR. LAYCOX: Oh, definitely.

24 MR. ADAMSON: The next item we wanted to  
25 point up at this stage is on page 19, section 3.12.  
26 As a school system grows, the incidence of children  
27 who require special education facilities increases.  
28 Services for the physically handicapped, emotionally  
29 disturbed, speech handicapped, deaf, psychological  
30 and psychiatric clinics and diagnostic educational







1 clinics can only be provided on a regional basis.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: What happens now to  
3 children in Pickering Township who require special  
4 educational services?

5 MR. ADAMSON: We have some facilities in  
6 School Area No. 2 and we bring in some of the children  
7 from other areas where their need is great to some of  
8 our academic vocational classes. There are other  
9 areas where we have to refer the parents to some  
10 outside assistance if we are unable to do anything  
11 particularly in our school system for them.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you any arrange-  
13 ment with the Metropolitan Toronto School Board in  
14 relation to special educational services?

15 MR. ADAMSON: Well, we have had some  
16 arrangements and this naturally depends on the avail-  
17 able facilities at this point, at the location that  
18 we have got them. These have worked out fairly well.

19 Perhaps if you would like a report we  
20 could give you something maybe in a bit more detail  
21 as to just how our present system is functioning. But  
22 I think the Board feels that it has quite a bit of room  
23 for improvement. But we would be glad if you were  
24 interested to give you a little more detail.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You have answered my  
26 question by saying that you can provide some special  
27 educational services but there is considerable room for  
28 improvement.

29 MR. ADAMSON: Yes. This is our feeling.

30 Section 3.13 says: "The services of a





1 research centre and curriculum planning department  
2 would do much to improve the quality of our instruction-  
3 al programme." We do have access to some of the  
4 research activities, but would like to have a little  
5 more active part perhaps in those.

6 "These clinical and school services are  
7 presently being provided by the larger units of adminis-  
8 tration within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto."  
9 We feel the children of this adjacent municipality  
10 should not be denied the benefits that they might  
11 derive from those services.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Are any of those services  
13 provided by the Provincial Department of Education  
14 that you may use?

15 MR. ADAMSON: I will have to check with  
16 the departmental representative here.

17 Apparently not. These have to be provided  
18 locally.

19 Mr. Laycox, perhaps you have something  
20 here.

21 MR. LAYCOX: In an article in the Toronto  
22 Telegram of October 19th, 1963, Mr. Murray Jones ---

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You believe in quoting  
24 the highest authority; is that right?

25 MR. LAYCOX: Well, I had not mentioned  
26 the name. Apparently you are familiar with the name.  
27 Mr. Murray Jones, the former Planning Commissioner of  
28 Metropolitan Toronto, quoted: "We have an opportunity  
29 to advance some new theories about government in the  
30 Metropolitan area. We are dealing with a complex,





1 seamless web."

2 The official plan recognizes that planning  
3 control and municipal works are carried out on both  
4 the Metropolitan and local area levels and that this  
5 basic division will continue irrespective of the  
6 actual form which municipal organization may take  
7 from time to time.

8 While the plan is geared to the present  
9 organization of a federated metropolitan municipality  
10 responsible for metropolitan services and functions  
11 and local area municipalities responsible for local  
12 services and functions, it deals explicitly only with  
13 those matters which are of area-wide or metropolitan  
14 concern and would do so even if the current organiza-  
15 tional structure were to be significantly altered.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you saying this by  
17 way of criticism?

18 MR. LAYCOX: To a point, sir, I think we  
19 are stating facts here. These are things that we  
20 have operated over the years -- facts that we have  
21 operated -- and within our township we have taken a  
22 great deal of direction from Mr. Murray Jones  
23 personally as a matter of fact some time ago when he  
24 was Planning Director or Planning Commissioner, and we  
25 have worked very closely.

26 We are not necessarily criticizing. We are  
27 accepting this as fact -- that while they are planning  
28 the Metropolitan area they are leaving some of the  
29 planning to the local planning boards within the area  
30 which we represent.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it not the intention  
2 of the law that the Metropolitan Planning Board prepare  
3 an overall plan and that the local boards continue their  
4 own planning provided their plans are in conformity  
5 with the Metropolitan plan?

6 MR. LAYCOX: That is true, sir. We  
7 are at the moment in our planning board going over the  
8 Metropolitan plan along with our own so that we will  
9 conform strictly to theirs.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: What do you think of  
11 the proposed Metropolitan plan in its effects on the  
12 future development of Pickering Township?

13 MR. LAYCOX: I can see nothing within the  
14 plan at the moment, Mr. Commissioner. We have studied  
15 the first four phases of the plan fairly thoroughly  
16 and, although we have suggested to the Metropolitan  
17 Planning Board that certain changes be made, they are  
18 nothing really drastic and they do conform in most part  
19 with our own plan, which was made up previous to theirs,  
20 I think, or during the same time that their plan was  
21 being prepared.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: In your earlier remarks  
23 you spoke of the need for industrial assessment in  
24 Pickering Township.

25 MR. LAYCOX: Yes, sir.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you feel that any  
27 restriction is being imposed upon further industrializa-  
28 tion in Pickering Township by the Official Plan?

29 MR. LAYCOX: I would say, sir, that a  
30 great deal more stress was placed on the western





1 municipalities in the original or the original concept  
2 of the Metropolitan plan. We now have a Planning  
3 Director within the township who has worked very  
4 closely with the Planning Board and as a result of  
5 this they are giving a little more attention to the  
6 eastern municipalities than they did, let us say, six  
7 months back.

8 They have revised their plans, their maps,  
9 to show more significantly the area bounded by --  
10 well, the confines of the Township of Pickering --  
11 where prior to this we were a shaded area and in-  
12 dustrial growth and commercial assessment, etcetera,  
13 were to the western municipalities. Now we feel  
14 with this revised plan they are giving us slightly  
15 more thought than they originally did in their  
16 original plan.

17 We are quite happy, Mr. Commissioner, with  
18 the way we are getting along with the Metropolitan  
19 Toronto Planning Board. They are assisting us in  
20 every way. I understand from one of their directors  
21 just recently that we are further advanced than most  
22 municipalities within the Metropolitan planning area  
23 in going over their master plan to conform with our  
24 own.

25 We spent a great deal of time this past  
26 three months on the Metro plan and our own. I think  
27 we have demonstrated, Mr. Commissioner, that we are  
28 within the concept of Metropolitan planning and very  
29 closely related to the Municipality of Metropolitan  
30 Toronto and yet, because of an artificial boundary line,







1 we do not share in any of the tax benefits of that  
2 Metro area.

3 MR. ADAMSON: You have probably been  
4 giving thought to many possible courses of action as  
5 you have studied the briefs that have been submitted  
6 to you by different people at different times. We  
7 suggest, Mr. Commissioner, that the following course  
8 of action might be particularly suited to our area.  
9 These are outlined on page 21, section 4 of the  
10 combined brief in the black cover.

11 The first one would be to add the Municipi-  
12 pality of Pickering Township to the Metropolitan  
13 Toronto organization in some manner for educational  
14 purposes. A second possibility ---

15 THE COMMISSIONER: How would that be done?

16 MR. ADAMSON: We have not attempted to  
17 see for ourselves how this might be operated. We  
18 have only felt that there was a need to somehow or  
19 other spread the cost of education. In this sugges-  
20 tion we were thinking that this might be one possi-  
21 bility. But as to the mechanics of it, I am afraid  
22 we do not have much by way of suggestion to offer

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, are you talking  
24 of the school system of the whole township or are  
25 you talking of Pickering Township's School Area No. 2?

26 MR. ADAMSON: Well, originally I suppose  
27 our emphasis was on School Area No. 2, because this is  
28 a sort of urban area and is similar to adjacent terri-  
29 tory. It was felt that that same thought should be  
30 given to the overall picture in the Township at the





1 same time. Whether it would be feasible to do this  
2 on a township-wide basis or not, we did not want to  
3 try to evaluate that.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: But what you are  
5 suggesting is that the school system of Pickering  
6 Township be added to the jurisdiction of the Metro-  
7 politan Toronto School Board?

8 MR. ADAMSON: Well, this would certainly  
9 tie it down pretty tightly. We did not want to be  
10 specific on this point. We wanted to simply suggest  
11 that somehow or other organizationally we should be re-  
12 lated more closely to the Metro School Board.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: And the reasons are  
14 financial purely, almost entirely?

15 MR. ADAMSON: Yes, financial and in order  
16 to make sure that with the school population that we  
17 have the children have the same sort of opportunities  
18 that they would in a built-up area, say, next door to  
19 them. But it is basically financial.

20 The second and perhaps alternative type of  
21 recommendation -- or perhaps by way of explanation of  
22 the first one, whichever way you want to look at it --  
23 would be to amalgamate all the school systems in the  
24 Metropolitan planning area and administer them in  
25 sections, divisions, or units on the basis of  
26 enrolment rather than municipal boundaries. In other  
27 words, it is to set up a school system on a slightly  
28 different basis than at present.

29 Of course, this is something which is  
30 only offered as a tentative suggestion and not as





1 something that we have given a great deal of thought  
2 to how it could be done.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You see, there has been,  
4 of course, a suggestion made to me that the school  
5 system of the Metropolitan Corporation be amalgamated.  
6 The criticism of that was that it would just be too  
7 big. You are prepared to amalgamate not only the  
8 school systems within the Metropolitan municipality  
9 but to add to them the school systems of the Metro-  
10 politan planning area which covers 13 additional  
11 municipalities.

12 MR. ADAMSON: Yes. I noticed some  
13 reference in the press to this sort of thing. The  
14 question of bigness is not in itself the thing that  
15 would be the stumbling block in my opinion. It would  
16 be a question of how you could perhaps divide respon-  
17 sibility, divide costs and so on. There might be  
18 some means whereby it could be amalgamated without  
19 losing some of the benefits from the smaller systems.

20  
21 -

22  
23  
24  
25 -

26  
27  
28 -







1 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't want to  
2 anticipate what you are going to say but are you also  
3 recommending that Pickering become a part of the  
4 Metropolitan Corporation, that is the Township of  
5 Pickering, or are you just prepared to attach your  
6 school system to Metro?

7 MR. ADAMSON: Our basic problem was one  
8 of school costs. Of course, we do have the municipal  
9 service problem as well, as Mr. Laycox has mentioned.

10 As far as the School Board Study was  
11 concerned we felt that unless there was some way to  
12 derive additional revenue this would seem to us to be  
13 the only solution. We didn't look forward to it  
14 particularly. It seemed to be the only thing to  
15 do to serve the children of the area properly.

16 MR. LAYCOX: I would add, Mr. Commissioner,  
17 a further suggested action would probably be that some  
18 tax-sharing arrangement with Metropolitan Toronto would  
19 be most desirable. Equalization maintenance assis-  
20 tance payments to education in the entire Metropolitan  
21 area would serve to equalize educational opportunity,  
22 cost, and the ability to pay. This probably could be  
23 applied to the entire region without any change in  
24 present municipal organization.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you not there in  
26 effect asking for the benefits which you would enjoy  
27 if you formed part of Metropolitan Toronto without  
28 actually becoming a part of it?

29 MR. LAYCOX: Basically, Mr. Commissioner,  
30 that is quite right. I think we feel the fact that





1 87 per cent of the entire population of the Township  
2 of Pickering does derive income from within the  
3 boundaries of the Metro area and we get no assistance  
4 from industrial or commercial assessment from that  
5 area. I think this is the strongest feeling we have  
6 about the fact that probably there should be some  
7 equalization maintenance from the Metro area. I  
8 speak only of the Township of Pickering. There is a  
9 slim possibility of other small municipalities adjacent  
10 to our borders.

11 Even in our rural areas a great many people  
12 are going out to the Metropolitan area or to Oshawa,  
13 Whitby, and Ajax to derive income. As a result, and  
14 I don't know whether this has any strict bearing, we  
15 don't have industrial development in the township.  
16 They are going outside and we are not deriving any  
17 benefit from industry or commerce within the confines  
18 of these Metro areas. Although we do have labour  
19 pools, home made as it were, industry feel that coming  
20 into a municipality with a 94 mill rate is not a  
21 pretty picture.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, of course, I am  
23 not unduly impressed with the 94 mill rate until I know  
24 what assessment it is related to, you see. I am  
25 going to check that. What I don't understand is  
26 this: You are asking that your educational system be  
27 amalgamated with the educational system of Metropolitan  
28 Toronto. You follow up by asking that Metropolitan  
29 Toronto should enter into some tax-sharing arrangement  
30 with Pickering Township for the reasons you have stated.







1 I am wondering why you don't go whole hog and don't  
2 ask that Pickering Township should become one of the  
3 area municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto?

4 MR. LAYCOX: Of course, Mr. Commissioner,  
5 on the basis of releases in the press I don't think  
6 Metropolitan Toronto are too happy about the idea of  
7 encompassing the Township of Pickering. It would  
8 appear that way. We feel we are a distressed area  
9 and they don't want to be burdened with another dis-  
10 tressed area.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not asking for  
12 that because you don't think it is realistic.

13 MR. LAYCOX: It is not realistic. We  
14 would like some assistance. We would also ask that  
15 the municipal unconditional grants be increased for  
16 municipalities over 20,000 population from \$3.75  
17 per capita to \$5.50 per capita or equal to that paid  
18 in Metropolitan Toronto.

19 It is also recommended that arrangements  
20 be made to supplement the cost of the municipal ser-  
21 vices of water and sewers to that part of the township  
22 embodying the dormitory area of residential develop-  
23 ment.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not clear as to  
25 what that would mean. Would you elaborate on that?  
26 I am not clear on what you mean by number 5: "Arrange-  
27 ments be made to supplement the cost of municipal  
28 services of water and sewers to that part of the  
29 township embodying the dormitory area of residential  
30 development."





1 MR. LAYCOX: Here again I think we are  
2 subtly asking for ---

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Money!

4 MR. LAYCOX: Money.

5 MR. ADAMSON: On the next page ---

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Before you go to the  
7 next page I notice that you have eliminated one of the  
8 suggestions which appear in the original brief of the  
9 school area. Is that intended to be eliminated?

10 MR. ADAMSON: Yes, that was taken out.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: That is No. 4.

12 MR. ADAMSON: Because it did not seem to  
13 fit the circumstances after study by the township on  
14 this. It just didn't seem to be suitable so we just  
15 took that one out.

16 In section 5 on page 22 we tried to anti-  
17 cipate what the solution along the lines of one or more  
18 of the suggested courses of action we mentioned might have  
19 on our mill rate. We did this just to see what sort  
20 of order of magnitude it would be.

21 Looking at municipal services where our  
22 present general levy is 22.5 mills, if the equivalent  
23 Metropolitan municipal grant were obtained, as mentioned  
24 in section 4.4, the change would not be very much. The  
25 mill rate would be about 19 mills.

26 For schools it would be a bigger change if  
27 we consider school area No. 2, where at present the 1964  
28 rate is 31.2 mills, under the Metropolitan Maintenance  
29 Assistance payments we would estimate that this would  
30 become about 20 mills.





1 In connection with mill rates for public  
2 schools Mr. Davis, the Minister of Education, said in  
3 January of this year when speaking to the House about  
4 the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan: "In order to ensure  
5 that Boards do not use the increases in grants to lower  
6 their mill rates or maintain unusually low mill rates,  
7 while at the same time spending at a level well under  
8 the foundation programme level, an overall limitation  
9 of grants has been provided for. As such Boards  
10 increase their local contribution towards education  
11 so that it approaches the mill rate for current opera-  
12 tions suggested by the province of 11 mills for  
13 elementary and 7 for secondary such Boards will, of  
14 course, receive all the grants to which the formulae  
15 would entitle them." That is the end of the quo-  
16 tation.

17 As you can see from this, Mr. Commissioner,  
18 the rate in Area No. 2, even if it derived the  
19 Metro Maintenance Assistance payments, would be 20  
20 mills, almost double the rate suggested by Mr. Davis.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: How did the recent  
22 changes in the provincial educational grants improve  
23 your position in Pickering Township?

24 MR. ADAMSON: You will notice in 1963  
25 we had a rate of 34 mills in this School Area No. 2.  
26 This is 31 mills this year and this is mainly because  
27 of this foundation tax plan. If this plan had not  
28 gone into effect we would have expected the rate to  
29 increase somewhat. So it has had an appreciable  
30 effect but not of the order of magnitude that we feel







1 is warranted at this time.

2 In one district in this School Area No. 2  
3 we have listed the mill rates that would apply. As  
4 you mentioned they would have to be checked to see if  
5 the assessment base is correct. For residential in  
6 1964 it was 87.4. This would become about 73 mills  
7 if both of the above changes took place. In com-  
8 mercial the change would be from 97 mills this year  
9 to about 80 mills.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, I was not  
11 talking about the correctness of the assessment basis.  
12 I was talking about their comparability. I was not  
13 saying the Toronto basis is better than the Pickering  
14 basis.

15 MR. ADAMSON: How these would compare with  
16 Toronto we are not quite sure. This is the effect it  
17 would have. To find out how important a factor it is  
18 we would have to wait to check the relative assessments.

19 Now we feel that the new level of taxation  
20 such as this might result in: (1) improved municipal  
21 services; (2) improved school services equivalent to  
22 other Metropolitan municipalities; (3) a tax rate  
23 comparable to other Metropolitan Toronto municipalities;  
24 (4) a competitive tax structure in order to develop a  
25 more realistic industrial and commercial tax base.

26 Now we have tried to prepare a summary of  
27 these points and perhaps Mr. Laycox could mention the  
28 first one.

29 MR. LAYCOX: Mr. Commissioner, I think in  
30 view of the fact that Mr. Adamson of the Area No. 2





1 School Board and I have worked so closely together on  
2 this probably we should both remain up here. We are  
3 going to go through this rapidly. I might add, Mr.  
4 Commissioner, that we feel that we are one of the very  
5 few municipalities that find the area school boards and  
6 the municipal councils getting along as closely as we  
7 do in the Township of Pickering.

8 In order to summarize we say that Pickering  
9 Township is under the control and administration of  
10 the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

11 MR. ADAMSON: The educational and municipal  
12 services are equivalent to Metropolitan Toronto. The  
13 educational tax source is almost 90 per cent residential  
14 and in public school area No. 2, 72 per cent of the  
15 population resides as a dormitory community.

16 MR. LAYCOX: Again I would dwell on the  
17 figure that 87 per cent of the residents of this area  
18 derive their income from Metropolitan Toronto industry  
19 and commerce and outside of the boundaries of the  
20 Township of Pickering. Further, the township does  
21 not derive any benefit from the taxation against that  
22 industry and commerce.

23 I have an uncanny faculty for quoting the  
24 top echelon, as you have suggested, Mr. Commissioner.  
25 In a recent judgment of Mr. J. A. Kennedy, Chairman of  
26 the Ontario Municipal Board, he commented that 30 per  
27 cent of the employees of industry located within the  
28 city limits of Sault Ste. Marie lived in Korah and  
29 Tarentous townships. In other words, he said the  
30 taxes from these industries are available to provide







1 services for the 70 per cent who live within the city  
2 but not for the 30 per cent who live in the outside  
3 townships.

4 MR. ADAMSON: As we see it, Mr. Commissioner,  
5 our future is closely tied in with what is happening in  
6 Metro and in turn we see that the Metro planners are  
7 wanting to see that the fringe area developing is a  
8 credit to the Metro complex as a whole. It seems  
9 unreasonable to us that artificial municipal boundaries  
10 would interfere with perhaps the health of the popu-  
11 lace or with their educational opportunities that would  
12 be available to our children and young people.

13 MR. LAYCOX: Mr. Commissioner, in con-  
14 clusion ---

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Before you conclude I  
16 have one more question, Mr. Laycox. You say in your  
17 brief that if what you propose is implemented one of  
18 the results would be a competitive tax structure which  
19 would develop a more realistic commercial and industrial  
20 tax base. Are you of the opinion it is higher taxa-  
21 tion in Pickering that is retarding commercial and  
22 industrial development?

23 MR. LAYCOX: Yes, I am of that opinion, Mr.  
24 Commissioner.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think it is  
26 rather due to the trend towards industrial and commer-  
27 cial development in a westerly direction?

28 MR. LAYCOX: As they say, Mr. Commissioner,  
29 people go to work with the sun at their backs and come  
30 come home with the sun at their backs. If this is





1 any criterion this is exactly what is happening to us.  
2 They are leaving the Township of Pickering to go  
3 west to work and come home in the evening with the  
4 sun at their backs. I don't know whether this has  
5 anything to do with the slowdown of commercial and  
6 industrial assessment in the eastern areas. Scar-  
7 borough are getting it abundantly right to our borders.  
8 It stops there. There is an imaginary line separating  
9 the two townships and Scarborough has an abundant  
10 industrial assessment whereas we are almost void of  
11 such.

12 I would conclude, Mr. Commissioner, in  
13 thanking you for your indulgence, and I would thank  
14 the press and Mr. Finnis. I would say that if there  
15 is anything that we could supply you with in the way  
16 of material to add to what we have presented this  
17 morning we will be only too happy to spend any amount  
18 of time in preparing this for you.

19 We would also add on behalf of the Area 2  
20 School Board and the municipality of the Township of  
21 Pickering that we would be honoured to have you with  
22 us while you are in the city. We would like to  
23 show you around the township and certainly if we were  
24 advised you were coming we would show you a royal  
25 time. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I have  
27 travelled through the township.

28 MR. LAYCOX: I heard you had.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I will remember your  
30 kind invitation. Thank you very much. We shall  
now adjourn for ten minutes.





1 ---Upon resuming.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Town of Ajax. Are  
3 you the Mayor?

4 SUBMISSION OF  
5  
6 THE TOWN OF AJAX

7 Appearances:

8 H. M. Smith	Mayor
9 Elwin Smyth	Member of Planning Board
10 B. C. Falby	Clerk-Treasurer

11  
12  
13  
14 MR. SMITH: Yes, I am Mr. Smith, Mayor  
15 of the Town of Ajax. We have also Mr. Elwin Smyth  
16 who is a member of our Planning Board, and also the  
17 representative of the Eastern District on the Metro  
18 Planning Board, and Mr. Falby, the Clerk-Treasurer  
19 of the Town here. I have a copy of the brief  
20 which I believe you have before you. It is a very  
21 short one.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I have read it, but  
23 I would like you to read it. I would like you to  
24 read it, and then I have one or two questions.

25 MR. SMITH: Re Ajax in relation to  
26 Metropolitan Toronto.

27 The following is submitted on behalf of  
28 the Ajax Council and Planning Board to state their  
29 opinions respecting the future status of the Town of  
30 Ajax in respect to Metropolitan Toronto.







1                   1. Ajax, as related to Metro Toronto:

2       The Town of Ajax is located in the Metropolitan Toronto  
3       Planning Area and as such is subject to Part XIV of the  
4       Municipality of Metro Toronto Act for purposes of  
5       planning.    The Town of Ajax lies within the scope of  
6       the Metro Toronto Conservation Authority.

7                   As part of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
8       Area, the town is subject to the controls set up by the  
9       Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.   It must not  
10      carry out any public work or pass any bylaw that  
11      does not conform with the Metropolitan Toronto Official  
12      Plan.    The town has no direct representation on the  
13      Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, but shares a  
14      representative with Pickering Village and Pickering  
15      Township.   Once the Official Plan is finally approved  
16      for Metropolitan Toronto, under the present statutes,  
17      the town and other municipalities in the planning  
18      area but not in the Municipality of Metropolitan  
19      Toronto, would be subject to those controls without  
20      representation on either the Metropolitan Toronto  
21      Planning Board or Metro Toronto Council.

22                  2. Future Status:   It is the opinion of  
23      the Ajax Planning Board and the Council of The  
24      Corporation of the Town of Ajax that Ajax, as a self-  
25      contained community, should remain in the Metropolitan  
26      Toronto Planning Area for purposes of planning and  
27      that the following safeguards should be provided in  
28      future legislation:

29      (a)       The Town, as a corporate body, should have  
30                direct representation on the Metropolitan





- 1 Toronto Planning Board and should not have to  
2 share representation with other municipalities;
- 3 (b) The Town of Ajax should have a voice on the  
4 Metropolitan Toronto Council where matters re-  
5 lating to Ajax are being considered. Under  
6 present legislation, if the Official Plan is  
7 adopted by Metropolitan Toronto, every im-  
8 provement in municipal services and facilities  
9 within the corporate boundaries of the Town of  
10 Ajax must conform to the Metropolitan Toronto  
11 Official Plan. If the Town of Ajax wishes to  
12 have changes made in the Metropolitan Toronto  
13 Official Plan to permit the installation of  
14 services which do not conform, the approval of  
15 the Metropolitan Toronto Council must be ob-  
16 tained, yet the Council of this Town would have  
17 no say whatsoever in the decision affecting its  
18 interest directly. (Section 2.19, subsection  
19 7(c) Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.)
- 20 (c) Any future legislation should require that the  
21 Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board recognize  
22 the need for balanced assessment within each  
23 self-contained municipality.

24 3. The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto  
25 Act, in respect to Planning, should provide for the  
26 right of appeal from decisions of the Metropolitan  
27 Toronto Council and Planning Board to a higher  
28 authority if their decisions are judged by the affected  
29 municipality to be unfavourable. This authority  
30 should be vested in the Ontario Municipal Board.







1 I just have a couple of comments to make,  
2 sir, and then answer questions if you have some. We  
3 feel that at present our industrial and residential  
4 assessment in this town is 47 per cent industrial,  
5 53 per cent residential. The people presenting the  
6 Pickering Township brief just prior to ours mentioned  
7 this problem of Bay Ridges. Bay Ridges were offered  
8 this development by Consolidated Building through the  
9 council of the Town of Ajax prior to the offer to  
10 Pickering Township, but because we were reputed by the  
11 federal government agency CMHC, the only totally  
12 planned community in Canada, we could see with this  
13 residential addition of Bay Ridges we would never catch  
14 up as far as the split between industrial and resi-  
15 dential balance of assessment so that we would not  
16 accept them, and that is why they ended up where  
17 they are at the present time or why they went else-  
18 where. We would not accept them at that time in  
19 the Town of Ajax.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You are satisfied  
21 with your balance of assessment? Are you restricting  
22 residential development?

23 MR. SMITH: We do, yes. We approve the  
24 future residential developments only in conjunction  
25 with the split of or the addition of industrial  
26 development. We are at the present time, as you  
27 would be aware, controlling vacant land of Perini  
28 Construction, the Duffin's Creek Estate. They own  
29 all the vacant land in Ajax at the present time. They  
30 of course have to come to us for subdivision agreements,





1 etcetera, and we hold them pretty rigidly to this  
2 thought that if they want to build more houses they  
3 have to bring us more industry.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: You suggest that any  
5 future legislation should require that the Metropolitan  
6 Toronto Planning Board recognize the need for balanced  
7 assessment within each self-contained municipality. Do  
8 you think that is feasible?

9 MR. SMITH: If the government sees fit to  
10 leave us the way we would like, we would of course  
11 prefer to be a self-contained community. We do not  
12 want to become part of the Metro area if we can pos-  
13 sibly avoid it. We feel in matters of planning as  
14 far as our borders are concerned, the Community Planning  
15 Branch perhaps of the Department of Municipal Affairs  
16 should control our border developments rather than the  
17 adjacent municipalities.

18 We really want to remain, if possible, a  
19 self-contained community, but you can see in the over-  
20 all planning of Metro as problems develop in this  
21 southern area you have to have some book of rules to  
22 control eventual development of the area.

23 We are quite willing to abide by the sort  
24 of overall plan, but we would prefer to be our own  
25 masters as far as our development is concerned and  
26 control our own percentage of industrial and residential  
27 development.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Ajax is not a dormitory  
29 municipality of Metropolitan Toronto?

30 MR. SMITH: No, not like Bay Ridges.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: The people of Ajax  
2 work in plants at Ajax?

3 MR. SMITH: Not primarily. I would say  
4 more of them go towards Oshawa, say, at the present  
5 time than towards Toronto. I think General Motors  
6 would probably poll the greatest number of residents  
7 for any one industry out of the Town of Ajax, but we  
8 do have 60-odd industries at the present time. I  
9 would say 500 might be the largest single industry,  
10 but we have a fair cross-section, let me say, of  
11 industry at the present time to the point that in one  
12 industry, unlike GM when they close down for strike  
13 purposes or changeover, we are not affected as in some  
14 other towns with 59 other plants remaining operating.  
15 We are fortunate in this.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just wondering  
17 how this area could be developed if the Planning Board  
18 insisted on balanced assessment within each municipality.  
19 There are a lot of people who would not be able to be  
20 housed. Wouldn't that be one of the consequences?

21 MR. SMITH: I am not too sure that I can  
22 really comment on that. I disagree in principle that  
23 it cannot be. I think if the overall plan is laid  
24 there as a Metropolitan Planning area, if they are  
25 going to control areas where they allow industry and  
26 where they allow housing, I can't see why they would  
27 not be able to balance this themselves.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Within each municipality?

29 MR. SMITH: Within each municipality. I  
30 am not really sufficiently informed to know what the







1 eventual regulations would be in this particular area  
2 so therefore I really do not feel I can comment.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting the  
4 Town of Ajax should have a voice on the Metropolitan  
5 Toronto Council when matters relating to Ajax are  
6 being considered. I presume that what you mean there  
7 is that when a change is made in the official Metro  
8 Plan which affects Ajax that Ajax should have a right  
9 to say something about it?

10 MR. SMITH: That is right. At the time  
11 that this addition would be made up, if we find it  
12 necessary to add additions to water plants and this  
13 sort of thing, and it had to go for approval to the  
14 Metropolitan Council, that we would be represented  
15 at that time that it was discussed, and they just  
16 wouldn't consider this and hand back something without  
17 a hearing as far as the Town is concerned.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: But it is the plan  
19 that you have in mind there? You are satisfied to  
20 remain within the Metropolitan Toronto Planning area?

21 MR. SMITH: Yes, I believe so. I do not  
22 really believe that we have any reason to say that we  
23 should not be part of it. We realize the overall  
24 problems. They are so great in this area. I think  
25 we are tied a little closer at the present time to  
26 Oshawa. On the 4th of July of this year we will  
27 become part of the Oshawa telephone exchange. That  
28 is, it will be a mutual telephone exchange.

29 Because of our industry and because we  
30 sell as industrialists more to Toronto areas, we have





1     tried for years to put our telephone exchange into  
2     Toronto.   We made all sorts of representations and  
3     discussions, but they sort of arbitrarily decided  
4     we will go to Oshawa.   The Bell Telephone in their  
5     planning seem to think we are more closely linked  
6     in that direction rather than towards the Metro area.

7             THE COMMISSIONER:   I suppose one can sum  
8     up your brief by saying you are satisfied with things  
9     as they are, and I can well understand why you should  
10    be.

11            MR. SMITH:   Yes.   I think we are in a  
12    very favourable situation at the present time.   We  
13    would like to remain that way if possible, but as I  
14    say, we also realize that this whole southern area is a  
15    big problem to the province and to planning.

16            THE COMMISSIONER:   How far are you from  
17    Oshawa?

18            MR. SMITH:   From Oshawa roughly ten miles.

19            THE COMMISSIONER:   I didn't realize it was  
20    as close as that.   Well, I think that is about all I  
21    have to ask you.

22            MR. SMITH:   Thank you, sir.

23            THE COMMISSIONER:   If any of your associates  
24    want to add anything I will be very glad to hear them.

25            MR. SMITH:   I believe Mr. Smyth would  
26    like to say something.

27            MR. SMYTH:   Mr. Commissioner, the Town of  
28    Ajax as you probably know was a war plant.

29            THE COMMISSIONER:   Oh, yes.   I was  
30    Director-General of Economics in the Department of







1 Munitions and Supply when that plant was first dis-  
2 cussed.

3 MR. SMYTH: Then you know all about it.  
4 At the time it was incorporated ten years ago there  
5 were about 3,000 people. Since that time we have  
6 grown to 8,000. We started with a few low-assessment  
7 houses, a few on the north side of 401. Very little  
8 industry. Finally the plants took over some of those  
9 old plants and started an industrial complex.

10 Now, the people in these last ten years have  
11 been very selective in their electing of people to  
12 positions on council and boards of the town. They  
13 had a vision of a progressive industrial town. One  
14 thing they did have their eye very closely peeled for  
15 was to have a balanced industrial-residential assess-  
16 ment, and today it is very close to that 50-50 which is  
17 supposed to be the ultimate.

18 The elected representatives have on all  
19 occasions resisted the low-cost assessment homes, and  
20 they have also resisted the frills that go with the  
21 growth of a new town in order to provide the essential  
22 services that are required. As a result the town  
23 has arrived at a position for natural growth. Although  
24 it is very slow, it is solid, and our funded liabilities  
25 are of such a size that our credit is of the highest  
26 order. With this background the citizens are vitally  
27 concerned that they are left to promote and develop  
28 their own municipality.

29 Now, of course at the moment this is being  
30 severely hampered by the development that we heard of





1 this morning, Bay Ridges. Very severely hurt, and the  
2 increased high school costs -- we are part of the Ajax-  
3 Pickering high school district, and the costs have  
4 been going up and up and up.

5 Now, on different occasions we have attempted  
6 to withdraw from that high school area to form our own  
7 board of education, but of course it has been without  
8 success. The increased costs of secondary schools are  
9 one of our biggest problems.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You are attributing  
11 that to the BayRidges development; is that right?

12 MR. SMYTH: Actually this is the big pro-  
13 blem.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Where do the people  
15 who live in BayRidges work?

16 MR. SMYTH: Bay Ridges, oh, I would imagine  
17 that 80 per cent to 90 per cent work in Toronto. I  
18 would imagine 80 to 90 per cent work in Toronto. Now,  
19 we believe that this is one of our biggest problems  
20 today. The people have been very careful to create  
21 and maintain a self-contained economic unit, and it is  
22 our greatest desire to remain so, as a complete single  
23 economic assessed municipality.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: What would happen if  
25 every little community with a population of 7,000 wanted  
26 to isolate itself from all the others and not share in  
27 any costs or responsibilities? Do you think you would  
28 get very far in the Province of Ontario?

29 MR. SMYTH: Yes and no. In our case,  
30 and this is the only one we can look at, every person







1 in that town, practically every civic-minded person  
2 has done a lot to develop that little town. There is  
3 no dearth of people who go on the different boards, the  
4 library board, planning board. First-class citizens  
5 have taken part in these, and as a result I think our  
6 good little progressive town is the answer; it is the  
7 reason it has arrived at this position.

8 Every municipality has problems. We  
9 could have had the BayRidges development. If we had  
10 it today with all its problems we would not be in this  
11 position, but this is the thing. The unfortunate part  
12 of it is when this development came along we immediately  
13 knew that high school costs would be just out of this  
14 world, and we didn't have a say at the time that that  
15 development went through, so we knew the exact con-  
16 ditions that were going to result. I don't think it  
17 was hardly fair to throw 3,000 reasonably -- not  
18 high assessment houses -- reasonably low assessment  
19 houses on an area that has no industry at all to back  
20 it up. We didn't think that was fair at all.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

22 MR. SMYTH: Mr. Falby, have you something  
23 you would like to add?

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I know you are not  
25 going to dissent from anything that was said.

26 MR. FALBY: Perhaps I could help to clarify  
27 some of these points. First of all, what they are  
28 trying to get at is that any one local municipality  
29 should not be controlled or affected by the decisions  
30 of another municipality. In other words, developments







1 that take place around our boundaries should be super-  
2 vised by a provincial authority rather than a group  
3 of other municipalities who might have their own  
4 local interests in this.

5 For instance, we had a development on our  
6 east side of a small shopping centre or small stores  
7 which we would have objected to had we ever had a  
8 chance. Again this Bay Ridges development, we refused  
9 it. We wouldn't have any part of it because we could  
10 see the consequences and yet in spite of it we have to  
11 pay for part of that development through the high  
12 school districts.

13 The councils and planning boards feel they  
14 have not sufficient representation or control over  
15 their affairs. What is the sense of them trying to  
16 run an efficient and economic unit when these other  
17 things will throw that all out of balance?

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
19 gentlemen. We will now adjourn to two o'clock.

20  
21 ---Luncheon adjournment.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 ---UPON RESUMING AT 2:00 P.M.

2 SUBMISSION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

3 APPEARANCES:

4 REEVE R. W. SPECK.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: The Township of  
6 Toronto -- are you prepared to go ahead, sir?

7 MR. SPECK: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. I  
8 believe you have a copy of our brief.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I have read it,  
10 yes.

11 MR. SPECK: Well, sir, I thought I  
12 would just come down and enlarge a few points in the  
13 brief. I think the brief is pretty well self-explanatory.  
14 I would like to stress to you, sir, that the  
15 Municipality is quite a size, about 44% of the total  
16 area of Metropolitan Toronto.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps we should  
18 annex Metro to the Township of Toronto!

19 MR. SPECK: Maybe so.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: That thought had  
21 not entered my mind until now.

22 MR. SPECK: We do find ourselves in a  
23 pretty good location on the lake immediately west of  
24 Toronto. We have about 12 miles on the lakefront and  
25 we run back about 10 or 11 miles to Steeles Avenue. That  
26 is roughly our boundaries. The neighbour to the west  
27 is the Town of Oakville.

28 We have quite a history, as the brief  
29 explains. We were predominantly rural for quite a  
30 number of years until the early 1950's, then found







1 ourselves somewhat as a bedroom municipality to the  
2 City of Toronto when urbanization first started. We  
3 found ourselves in difficulty at that time too because  
4 we had a tremendous influx of new home owners wishing  
5 to reside in our particular district and at that time  
6 there was not too much interest shown by industry and  
7 commerce to come out at that time. We had a sharp  
8 increase in taxation in the early 1950's but towards  
9 the middle of the 1950's we realized what had happened  
10 and we sort of slowed the development down and put a  
11 drive on to see if we could introduce industry into  
12 our area and we have been quite successful.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say you  
14 tried to slow development down do you mean residential?

15 MR. SPECK: Yes, that is correct, until  
16 we got a more acceptable assessment picture in the  
17 Township. At the moment we have a population of around  
18 75,000 and we have about 120 million assessment and  
19 it is about balanced. It is about 55% roughly  
20 residential and about 45% commercial and industrial,  
21 which puts us in a pretty good position financially.

22 We have worked this out by our own  
23 Municipality and we have had some extremely good  
24 promotional tours, may I say, with an industrial  
25 film and so on, and the results have been exceptional.

26 Now when we first started it was, as  
27 I said before, rural. We sort of broke the Township  
28 up in a couple of areas; the southern part being  
29 the part that was interesting to developers and people  
30 moving out from the City, and we formed a Board of





1 Education in the early 1950's with the southern portion  
2 of the Township. Since that time the new expressways  
3 have gone through and 401 is complete through the  
4 Township and 403 is being mapped out and we can see  
5 there is going to be somewhat of an explosion very  
6 shortly and we want to prepare ourselves for it.

7 Last year we were successful in drafting  
8 a Bill for the Legislature putting the Township as one  
9 unit with one Board of Education for the whole of  
10 the Township for elementary education and secondary  
11 education along with the two municipalities of Port  
12 Credit and Streetsville going in with us for secondary  
13 school purposes.

14 We feel now we are in a position to  
15 service almost all of the Township with sanitary sewers  
16 and water and roads and such and that this gives a  
17 wider choice to industry to locate on the new express-  
18 ways. The Municipality as a whole will receive the  
19 benefit of the assessment for educational purposes.

20 We have commenced discussions with  
21 the Town of Port Credit and the Town of Streetsville  
22 towards eventual amalgamation with them into one unit.  
23 I think our objective eventually will be towards a  
24 city of some sort and we would think that Port Credit  
25 and Streetsville would be wise to join with us towards  
26 that status; particularly with Port Credit having the  
27 new home of the Canada Steamship Lines, the new docks  
28 and really it serves a much greater area than the Town  
29 of Port Credit. For a number of reasons we think it  
30 would be most advantageous to us all.







1 This would leave us at the beginning  
2 as a member municipality of the County of Peel, which  
3 is a rather active county and includes the Town of  
4 Brampton and the Township of Chinguacousy and  
5 Bramalea is now developing quite substantially and  
6 we are discussing with them at the moment the production  
7 and distribution of water from the Lake to the Brampton -  
8 Bramalea district on a joint basis with the Township  
9 of Toronto.

10 Streetsville has its water supply out  
11 of the river which is not in the opinion of many the  
12 best and the intention would be to take water into  
13 that particular district for seven or eight thousand  
14 people that live there.

15 We have been a member of the Metropolitan  
16 Toronto Planning Area, being one of the fringe  
17 municipalities, since its beginning in 1953. I have  
18 sat as the western district member for Port Credit  
19 and Streetsville and the Township of Toronto for the  
20 last five years. We think this type of planning is good.  
21 It has certainly, I think, been an advantage for the  
22 Township of Toronto and we have had no disagreement  
23 with it.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't feel it  
25 has held you back?

26 MR. SPECK: No, it has not. I don't  
27 think it has held us back any. I think in fact it  
28 has indicated the manner in which you should develop  
29 without this hodge-podge jumping from here and there.  
30 It is more on a regulated basis and we accept this and







1 we think it is right economically and proper.

2 We do believe that maybe it should take  
3 in a larger scope than what it does at the moment.  
4 Bramalea and Brampton are not included in the fringe  
5 area because they don't abut the boundaries of Metro  
6 Toronto. They are our neighbours but not the  
7 neighbours of Etobicoke and there has been some  
8 development there that has concerned us, the fact  
9 that they have used artesian wells as their point of  
10 production of water.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: In Brampton or  
12 Bramalea?

13 MR. SPECK: Both of them. The water  
14 for Brampton actually comes from outside the boundaries.  
15 The Township of Chinguacousy engineers have indicated  
16 to us this is not going to last forever. It probably  
17 has a source that would supply approximately forty-five  
18 to fifty thousand people. At that time it might be  
19 necessary to look for another source.

20 I think planning now should include at  
21 least the routes and manners and means of taking that  
22 water in conjunction with our own system. This is  
23 exactly what we are discussing with Brampton and  
24 Chinguacousy at the moment to make sure that we won't  
25 be compelled to take water mains through built up  
26 areas. I think the routes should be protected and  
27 ready to produce.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think control  
29 by the Metropolitan Planning Board would be necessary  
30 for that?





1 MR. SPECK: Either the Metropolitan  
2 Planning Board or a planning agency in the southern  
3 part of Peel County and maybe extending westward  
4 to Halton County as a planning area simply because  
5 it has always been intended, I think at the metropolitan  
6 level, to adopt an official plan for the metropolitan  
7 area, including the 13 fringe municipalities.

8 Now an official plan is a document that  
9 is agreed upon and is approved by the Minister of  
10 Municipal Affairs and any changes to that entail quite  
11 a routine. If we had an official plan on the Township  
12 of Toronto in our Metropolitan Official Plan and we  
13 wanted to make a change, we would have to submit it  
14 to the Metropolitan Council, an elected group, and  
15 the decision would rest somewhat on their shoulders  
16 unless we wanted to appeal to the Municipal Board on  
17 every occasion.

18 This is a problem as far as we are  
19 concerned. We have our own official plan at the  
20 moment which works. The Planning Board hears any  
21 proposals for changes and they recommend to the elected  
22 body, our Council, and the Council agrees or disagrees  
23 and then it is submitted to the Minister and finally  
24 to the Municipal Board, without going via Metropolitan  
25 Council.

26 If the Metropolitan Official Plan goes  
27 on it is a different picture. It is a metropolitan  
28 document and would be administered by the Metropolitan  
29 Council on which we would have no representation  
30 whatsoever. This point does concern us but I think it







1 is a technicality that legislation could work out. We  
2 have no disagreement with the theory behind it.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Would there be any  
4 problem with your plan conforming to the requirement  
5 of the Metro Official Plan?

6 MR. SPECK: Not at the moment. It is  
7 pretty well compatible at the moment although the fear,  
8 I think, is this that trends change and it is impossible  
9 to put an official plan on today that probably would  
10 be acceptable five or ten years from now. Trends  
11 necessitate a change and if it is in the hands of  
12 another elected body on which we have no representation  
13 they could, may not but could, somewhat deter development  
14 in our own area if they chose.

15 We would have no right to argue but  
16 could only present ourselves as an elected body to  
17 another elected body. That is not too democratic.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: What possible change  
19 would you suggest there?

20 MR. SPECK: The only possible change  
21 that I could suggest would be that the Metropolitan  
22 Official Plan as it affects the fringe municipalities,  
23 and ours is no exception, that a request for change  
24 in the Official Plan would be dealt with by the  
25 Minister directly rather than go to the Metropolitan  
26 Council. Within their own boundaries certainly they  
27 have jurisdiction but on the fringe areas I would  
28 somewhat hesitate to have them put at the mercy of  
29 another elected body. If it were the Department of  
30 Municipal Affairs I don't think we would have any





1 objection. Whether this would work or not I don't know.  
2 We would not like to see the idea of the Metropolitan  
3 Planning Area go out of existence.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: The Metropolitan  
5 Official Plan is still a proposed plan. It has not  
6 been adopted. Is the consent of Toronto Township  
7 necessary for the adoption of the plan?

8 MR. SPECK: Yes, it is.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: So that the fringe  
10 areas are consulted, they are being consulted now?

11 MR. SPECK: Yes, that is correct.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: The plan presumably  
13 will not be adopted until their views have been heard  
14 and the Minister will have to approve of the plan.

15 MR. SPECK: That is correct.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: You are saying to me  
17 that any change in the plan --

18 MR. SPECK: In the future.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: In the future, would  
20 be determined by Metropolitan Council alone?

21 MR. SPECK: That is correct.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Would not the Minister  
23 have to approve the change?

24 MR. SPECK: After Metropolitan Council  
25 had dealt with it.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: You would be able  
27 to go to the Minister then if you were not satisfied  
28 with the change?

29 MR. SPECK: That is correct. We feel  
30 though we should not have to go through another elected







1 body in every proposed change. This seems to be a  
2 little, as I said, undemocratic. This was our major  
3 concern.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I see your point.

5 MR. SPECK: There is one other thing.  
6 I think you do have the Auditor's Report there. It  
7 shows if we were one of the member municipalities what  
8 it would have meant in tax dollars. Well, tax dollars  
9 today equal certain figures and five years from now  
10 they may not be the same. It may be less.

11 In the past we have dealt with Metropolitan  
12 Toronto on our sewage. There is a new sewage plant  
13 at the west end of the City, namely the Lakeview plant.  
14 It is a cooperative undertaking between the Ontario  
15 Water Resources, ourselves, and Metropolitan Toronto.  
16 It is designed to be a fifty or sixty million gallon  
17 plant. We have had no problems in working with the  
18 City or the Metropolitan District. Where the new  
19 airport is we have entered into arrangements for  
20 the sewage to go to the Humber plant, much the same  
21 as at the Lakeview plant, and it has worked out  
22 quite satisfactorily.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Has Malton come  
24 under the jurisdiction of the Township?

25 MR. SPECK: Yes.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it a police village?

27 MR. SPECK: Yes. A small part of the  
28 Malton area is. The new airport is not in the police  
29 village.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: It is entirely in the







1 Township?

2 MR. SPECK: Yes. The police village  
3 is a smaller part of the Malton population. Quite a  
4 number of the new developments are out of the village.  
5 You would not know whether you are really in the  
6 village or not. They are not too active from the  
7 point of view of administration. We do police work  
8 and fire and so on. We haven't been successful in  
9 having it dissolved yet although we think it should be.  
10 Its usefulness has maybe been outlived.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You mentioned Bramalea  
12 and Brampton. I have visited both places. I was  
13 interested in the Bramalea development. How does it  
14 affect the Township?

15 MR. SPECK: It really has not any effect  
16 as far as we are concerned. It is a good development.  
17 It has, I would say, a good ratio of assessment in it.  
18 There are lots of factories.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Bramalea?

20 MR. SPECK: Yes. There are quite a  
21 number of new factories; Northern Electric has a new  
22 plant.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: General Motors?

24 MR. SPECK: Ford Motors is in Bramalea  
25 and there is Lipton Tea. They have quite a number of  
26 good plants and the balance on assessment is good in  
27 Bramalea. It really has not had any adverse effect  
28 as far as we are concerned except on one thing and this  
29 again I think would have been eliminated if they had  
30 been under the Metropolitan Planning Agency.





1                   They did locate a sewage plant in the  
2 Township of Toronto just below the northern borders  
3 that services both the Town of Brampton and the  
4 Township of Chinguacousy. That is the Bramalea section.  
5 It is not, in my opinion, the most desirable thing  
6 because it is on a somewhat dry creek. There was  
7 hardly any flow and I believe the Ontario Water  
8 Resources -- it is under their jurisdiction, of course  
9 and they are experimenting with treatments and what  
10 not to see if they can improve it.

11                   I really think eventually that the  
12 sewage should be transported to the Lake and disposed  
13 of properly. We do have to start some of these things  
14 because of financial means in the beginning and  
15 eventually as assessment rose you are rich enough to  
16 introduce big pipes going to the Lake.

17                   I think that is really all I have to  
18 say, Mr. Commissioner. We think we have an economic  
19 unit at 70,000 acres that is in our Township. We  
20 think we have room for a proposed population of well  
21 in excess of a million people.

22                   THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking of  
23 the Township alone now?

24                   MR. SPECK: Yes, the Township alone.  
25 We have 70,000 acres and at 20 persons an acre that  
26 is well in excess of a million. We do often wonder  
27 how big a municipality should get; how far we should  
28 get from the people. We realize when you get a million  
29 people it is quite a number of constituents and how  
30 many representatives should you have to stay close to







1 them?

2 The theme seems to be, we hear it every  
3 day, that we become pretty dictatorial the farther  
4 away we get. We do believe that the 70,000 acres  
5 would make a pretty desirable unit with all its  
6 amenities, with rivers and valleys and highways and  
7 airports and so on.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You say in your  
9 brief, at the bottom of page 13: "The relationship  
10 and responsibilities of this super agency (by which  
11 I believe you mean the Metropolitan Toronto Planning  
12 Board) to local planning boards and the Department of  
13 Municipal Affairs should be examined to provide for a  
14 more streamlined and efficient system of handling  
15 day-to-day planning matters, with more emphasis on  
16 local autonomy in this regard."

17 What do you mean by that?

18 MR. SPECK: Almost every planning matter,  
19 regardless of how small it is, has to go through this  
20 long procedure. First of all, it has to go to our  
21 Planning Board and a public meeting held; then to our  
22 Council. The Council makes a decision on it and it  
23 is then sent to the Minister. The Minister in turn  
24 sends it to the Metropolitan Planning Board. They meet  
25 once a month. It goes back to the Minister again. This  
26 is only for an official plan change. It comes back  
27 to the Municipality in two or three months time or  
28 even longer. Then we must follow up with a zoning by-law,  
29 which goes to the Ontario Municipal Board and through  
30 their procedure. By the time a simple planning matter is





1 resolved six months have gone by.

2 We feel this could be streamlined in  
3 some way for matters that are not that important. I  
4 am not talking about a major land use change but  
5 simply one so that a builder or a commercial person  
6 who works on building seasons -- they are pretty  
7 anxious when March comes to get that undertaking well  
8 in hand by at least the late summer.

9 Now, we have seen these things drag  
10 out until seven or eight months. This is our only  
11 criticism of the long procedure it goes through. Prior  
12 to the Metropolitan Planning Agency we dealt directly  
13 with the Minister and it did not have to go through  
14 all these things. Now everything goes through that  
15 and causes delays.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the Metropolitan  
17 Planning Board?

18 MR. SPECK: Yes, that is right. If there  
19 were some method to handle simple things a little more  
20 rapidly I think we would be more and more pleased and  
21 I think the people would.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Now you go on to  
23 say on page 14: "If amalgamation of the present 13  
24 Metropolitan Municipalities into one large Municipality  
25 occurs, the theory of a super agency is still valid."

26 That is, if the Metropolitan Municipalities  
27 were amalgamated you would still be prepared to form  
28 parts of the Metropolitan Planning Agency?

29 MR. SPECK: Certainly. The second alter-  
30 native is there in case such a thing did not happen. We





1 still believe very strongly in area planning, regional  
2 planning on a large basis.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You do suggest the  
4 possibility of a Southern Peel County Planning Agency  
5 but you prefer the overall agency?

6 MR. SPECK: Yes. We think that the  
7 overall would be probably more acceptable.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Now you refer to  
9 the report of your auditors, Gunn Roberts and Co., on  
10 the Township of Toronto becoming a part of the  
11 Metropolitan Toronto system. I have that report and  
12 I have read it. The Gunn Roberts and Co. estimated  
13 that had the Township of Toronto been part of the  
14 Metropolitan system in 1963 the Township's assessment  
15 would have been 216 million, as opposed to the actual  
16 assessment of 109 million. This is due to the different  
17 basis of assessment.

18 MR. SPECK: That is correct.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Could you explain  
20 the difference on the basis of assessment?

21 MR. SPECK: Yes. Metropolitan Toronto  
22 uses about 33-1/3% of actual value as their basis of  
23 assessment.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: That is, they relate  
25 assessment to 1940?

26 MR. SPECK: That is correct.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: You say it is about  
28 one-third of actual value?

29 MR. SPECK: Yes. Ours is based on about  
30 one-fifth, about 20%. We will be, I think, in the very







1 near future reassessing on the basis of a different  
2 factor and we don't want to do this while we are still  
3 involved in the County to the extent we are. We feel  
4 the whole County may do this at once rather than one  
5 Municipality doing it and using the equalizing factor.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't use the  
7 provincial equalizing factor now?

8 MR. SPECK: No, not yet. We are trying  
9 to persuade throughout the County of Peel for this to  
10 be done.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: So it is meaningless  
12 to compare your mill rate with the mill rate in effect  
13 in Metropolitan Toronto?

14 MR. SPECK: Absolutely; because of the  
15 difference in basis of assessment. I think the only  
16 fair way to assess the tax is to take a house in the  
17 opinion of a competent realtor or competent assessment  
18 man and value it at \$20,000.00 and find out what are  
19 the taxes in the Township of Toronto versus the Township  
20 of Etobicoke or North York.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: It is the only proper  
22 comparison. Now you also say in pointing to the  
23 estimated additional cost to Toronto Township if it  
24 became one of the area municipalities of Metropolitan  
25 Toronto, you say that the ratepayers of the Township  
26 of Toronto would have to pay higher taxes without any  
27 indication of changes in services if it were part of  
28 the Metropolitan system.

29 Are you saying there that your services  
30 are pretty much of the same standard as those in the





1 area municipalities of Metro?

2 MR. SPECK: Yes, I would. I think we  
3 have as good as any water system, sewage system,  
4 library system. We have a 100 man police force,  
5 permanent firemen, everything on a comparable basis  
6 with any municipality. The only thing we haven't  
7 is a rapid transit and I think it will be some time  
8 before it reaches out into our area. When it does  
9 I think we will be ready for it.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You have enough  
11 expressways?

12 MR. SPECK: Yes. They have cut us into  
13 ribbons but we have worked our way out of it. It  
14 works pretty good.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: How about schools  
16 in comparison to schools in the Metro municipalities?

17 MR. SPECK: Do you mean the standard  
18 of education?

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

20 MR. SPECK: I would say from what I am  
21 told -- I better be careful because the education  
22 fellows are at me sometimes -- but I would say the  
23 education under the new Board of Education is at par  
24 with anywhere in the Province. I think the Minister  
25 of Education has said this. Mind you he is our member!

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to say  
27 he is the member from Peel County.

28 MR. SPECK: It has worked exceptionally  
29 well with the exception of 1953. Really now we have  
30 straightened out many areas. As the brief states in







1 the Malton area, effective for the 1952 taxation year.  
2 Township School Area #1 was formed. Effective for the  
3 1956 taxation year this Township School Area absorbed  
4 twelve of the remaining public school sections, which  
5 left the Township of Toronto at the beginning of 1956  
6 with the South Peel Board of Education, covering almost  
7 all of the south half of the Township; Township School  
8 Area #1, covering almost all the north half of the  
9 Township; School Section #19, being a union with the  
10 Town of Port Credit.

11                   It has now come under one complete Board  
12 with one member from each Ward. I think there are one  
13 or two from the Separate School group and one from  
14 Port Credit and one from Streetsville. This makes a  
15 reasonably strong Board and the staff is, I think,  
16 comparable with any staff. I think teachers' salaries  
17 must be at the same rate as they are in Etobicoke and  
18 Long Branch.

19                   THE COMMISSIONER: Do you find it  
20 difficult to recruit teachers?

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 MR. SPECK: I think that the elementary  
2 school teachers are a little more plentiful now than  
3 they were. The secondary are still somewhat short,  
4 but I think it is the supply and demand position and  
5 I suppose it will work itself out as quickly as it  
6 can -- according to the education people, that is.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: You talked in your  
8 brief about negotiations between Toronto Township and  
9 the Town of Port Credit and the Town of Streetsville  
10 on amalgamation?

11 MR. SPECK: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you thinking there  
13 in terms of a city or ---

14 MR. SPECK: Well, may I explain it this  
15 way? At the moment the Township of Toronto is  
16 supplying sanitary ~~sewer~~ services to the Township of  
17 Port Credit. They had their own plant originally at  
18 the mouth of the Credit River. After discussions  
19 with them it was felt more advantageous to transport  
20 their sewage to the lake plant, which is about a mile  
21 and a half, a mile.

22 We are now discussing supplying them with  
23 water. We have our large water plant on what we call  
24 the old Long Branch Rifle Range property. They have  
25 a water plant very close to the Texaco oil refinery  
26 on the west side of the Credit. Streetsville, as I  
27 said before, are using river water.

28 We have three developments in the northwest  
29 section of our township who own around nine or ten  
30 thousand acres, namely the Taylor Corporation, the





1 Highbury group and the Howardale group and the plan  
2 is that they will not proceed unless they use Lake  
3 Ontario water, and eventually taking all their sewage  
4 to the Clarkson sewage treatment plant.

5 We have been negotiating with Streetsville  
6 to supply them with water. We are now using their  
7 Streetsville plant temporarily to get this construction  
8 off the ground. Then the big scheme coming into  
9 effect with the big tunnel coming up from the Clarkson  
10 area will cope with Streetsville sewage and do away  
11 with the Streetsville sewage plant altogether.

12 So the plan in the amalgamation talks has  
13 been that it would be a plan towards total amalgamation  
14 in, say, five years' time or six years' time with  
15 step by step servicing amalgamations during that  
16 period. We would hope to proceed to the Municipal  
17 Board with the overall plan before we start anything,  
18 having their approval of what our eventual end is to  
19 be. Then we would proceed -- whether by putting  
20 one more service in, such as police in the Port Credit  
21 area where they have only three or four policemen and  
22 where we have hundreds, and firemen in Streetsville.  
23 They have only voluntary people. They would be  
24 brought into the fold of the large scheme and by the  
25 of  
26 time/five or six years (whatever the period of time)  
27 this thing would dovetail together with the Board's  
28 approval. This is our plan towards putting this  
29 all together.

30 This would have advantages for the Town-  
ship of Toronto. While they may appear small, they







1 are important, I think, because the docks are a very  
2 important thing for that whole western section from  
3 Toronto out.

4 We would like to see one name for the whole  
5 area rather than three names -- Port Credit, Streets-  
6 ville and one other new name that we would have to  
7 have, because we cannot call it "Toronto". And we  
8 would like to see the advantages of having a central  
9 post office for all the districts such as Metropolitan  
10 Toronto has -- Toronto 1 to 20 or 30, whatever would  
11 be necessary.

12 These are advantages that would prove  
13 beneficial, I think, for the Township of Toronto and  
14 also to give an identification to many of our industries  
15 that want a name, not just the Township of Toronto but  
16 the Town of Such-and-Such -- Port Credit, for example.  
17 Then when the time comes and our rural acres sort of  
18 disappear the time would be ready then for consideration  
19 of moving into a city status.

20 Maybe not; maybe by that time area services  
21 will be more in line. Maybe Peel County may at the  
22 same time get into the servicing business of producing  
23 and distributing water and the collection and treatment  
24 of sewage. We still may remain a part of Peel County  
25 even though we would become the City of Port Credit.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not thinking  
27 then of separating from the county?

28 MR. SPECK: No. I think the County of  
29 Peel would almost disappear. We pay 62 per cent of  
30 every bill in the County of Peel at the moment. I





1 think with our withdrawal the thing would just disappear;  
2 it would not be able to exist, or if it did it would  
3 not be able to do anything.

4 We would like to gradually work towards  
5 this and if the future of the county is to be changed  
6 and more added responsibilities for them we would gladly  
7 remain a part of the county even though we may be  
8 called the City of So-and-So.

9 Really the County of Peel has something  
10 like the Metropolitan form of government, only with  
11 less powers. It is really an area serving municipali-  
12 ties. The north may not need it at the moment. It  
13 is certainly becoming a playground for our area and  
14 for Toronto in around the Caledon Hills and so on.  
15 It certainly needs protection in planning.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: What proportion of  
17 your area is still rural?

18 MR. SPECK: I would say 60 per cent or  
19 maybe more -- maybe 70 per cent.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to say it  
21 looked to me ---

22 MR. SPECK: All the northern section is  
23 pretty well rural, though the highways are starting  
24 to break it up. They are becoming pretty active as  
25 far as inquiries are concerned and we are planning our  
26 services to finally go right through to our borders --  
27 right through to our borders of Steeles Avenue.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you find that the  
29 rural section inhibits urbanization of the southern  
30 part?







1 MR. SPECK: No. I think everybody in  
2 the north is anxious for urbanization to take place  
3 in the north part of the township as soon as possible.  
4 I would say that there are not 5 per cent, any more  
5 than 10 per cent of the owners of land in the northern  
6 part of our township that are what you call agricultura-  
7 lists. There is a tremendous amount of speculation,  
8 such as the three large holdings of 10,000 acres.  
9 They are leased back to the original owners until  
10 such time as the development actually starts.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: That really answers my  
12 question as to the objection of the rural element.

13 Well, you are saying then that Toronto  
14 Township as it is developing, as you are planning its  
15 development, can be a self-contained viable municipality?

16 MR. SPECK: I would say yes, it could.  
17 We have the lake for the main source of our water,  
18 which is one of the most important things. We do not  
19 depend upon anybody for that.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: After all, the movement  
21 is towards the west. How about your relationship with  
22 Oakville and urban territory on your western boundaries?

23 MR. SPECK: Oakville is proceeding at not  
24 as great a rate as we are. It is because we are  
25 immediately west of Toronto. But they are feeling the  
26 impact to some extent.

27 They have done exactly what we are trying  
28 to do. There was the Town of Oakville, the Township  
29 of Trafalgar and places like Bronte that sat down  
30 and discussed the amalgamation over a period of two





1 or three years and eventually came out with the Town  
2 of Oakville reaching up to the same boundaries that  
3 we have -- that is, Steeles Avenue on the north and  
4 proceeding west is the northern boundary of Oakville.

5 I think they are planning their future  
6 somewhat in the same way as we are. They are using  
7 the lake as their starting point and gradually intro-  
8 ducing an official plan that will give them control  
9 so they will not get slivered out of them to become  
10 quite expensive. While we have not had any great  
11 discussions with them we have had some because one  
12 corner of a watershed that runs into Oakville at the  
13 very western part of the township -- and it is a  
14 very small portion -- they would like to have transported  
15 over to the Clarkson plant. We have not entered into  
16 any serious discussions on this but I think it can be  
17 worked out.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you feel that  
19 Toronto Township and Oakville are one social and  
20 economic community?

21 MR. SPECK: Yes, I do. I do because  
22 we have that large Ford plant in Oakville. Many of  
23 the employees live in the Township of Toronto.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: That was going to be  
25 my next question.

26 MR. SPECK: Many of them live in the  
27 Township of Toronto. We have the new Ontario Research  
28 Foundation in the township and we are going to have  
29 people living in Oakville who are going to work on  
30 the research no doubt. Unless you knew the boundary







1 was there you would not see any difference going from  
2 Oakville into Toronto Township and vice versa.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you see the possible  
4 development in due course of another Metro west of  
5 Etobicoke?

6 MR. SPECK: I do, but some people disagree  
7 with me. I think it is quite possible. I think it  
8 is quite possible, though I think one step away from  
9 it is the amalgamation of the Township of Toronto,  
10 Port Credit and Streetsville. I think that is one  
11 deterring thing. I do not think that encourages it  
12 at all. I think they should be amalgamated south  
13 and then have a look at the Metropolitan system at a  
14 later date.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, you men-  
16 tioned the docks at Port Credit. They interested me  
17 when I visited there. They are quite elaborate. Are  
18 they operating?

19 MR. SPECK: Oh, yes.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: At a high rate?

21 MR. SPECK: I do not know what the capacity  
22 is because I am not that familiar with it, but I do  
23 know that it is unusual if you do not see a ship in there.  
24 I think they have quite a trade in cargo. I know many  
25 of the industries around Oakville right through to, I  
26 would say, towards Burlington all come down to the  
27 docks at Port Credit; and that includes Etobicoke and  
28 all that particular district. They all funnel there.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, thank you very  
30 much for answering my questions.







1 MR. SPECK: Mr. Commissioner, it was a  
2 pleasure.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF  
METROPOLITAN TORONTO AND REGION  
CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

---

Appearance:

Dr. G. Ross Lord

---

THE COMMISSIONER: I just want to take  
another look at this little area.

DR. LORD: I will just introduce myself.  
I am G. Ross Lord, the Chairman of the Metropolitan  
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. That is  
not my full-time position. I am Professor and head  
of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the  
University of Toronto.

I have had a little experience in planning  
matters. I am Vice-Chairman of the North York Plan-  
ning Board and I have seen that municipality grow in  
25 years from 20,000 to 300,000 people; so we have  
had a hectic time up there.

I thought, sir, that rather than deal with  
the brief in detail I would like to give you a little  
background information to indicate why I think our  
Authority has been successful and why it is envied  
by a great many similar Authorities in the United  
States.

We were formed in 1957 by an amalgamation  
of the four area Authorities, Conservation Authorities,  
chiefly at the instigation of Metropolitan Toronto,







1 so that we could present one budget to the Metropolitan  
2 Council. We are a thousand square miles in area.  
3 Metropolitan Toronto is 240 square miles. We are one  
4 of 32 similar Authorities in southern Ontario, comprising  
5 about half the area of southern Ontario.

6 There are roughly 450 municipalities in-  
7 volved in all of these and 20,000-odd square miles.

8 One of the strong points in this movement has been the  
9 contribution of ordinary citizens. There are some  
10 700 people involved in the Authority work. These  
11 Authorities, as I say, have been very successful in  
12 Ontario. There is not anything on the North American  
13 Continent quite like them.

14 I have tried to analyse some of the reasons  
15 why they are successful. I think the first is the  
16 mode by which they were formed. They were formed, as  
17 you know, sir, by the calling of a meeting of all of  
18 the municipalities in a watershed. An Authority is  
19 based on the watershed or the water flowing into a  
20 river. At this inaugural meeting the large munic-  
21 ipality will have one or more representatives depending  
22 on its population and if two-thirds of them are present  
23 and two-thirds of them vote to form an Authority, then  
24 the Minister is asked to form an Authority. Once it  
25 is formed it is a corporate body and has the powers  
26 under the Act.

27 When the Authority is formed the repre-  
28 sentatives to the Authority are on the basis of popu-  
29 lation. Each city, town, village and township (but  
30 not counties) is represented.

Right here a very interesting thing happened





1 in the formation of our Authority and I attribute a  
2 lot of its success to this. That was, that while the  
3 great Metropolitan Toronto has 92 per cent of the  
4 population in our conservation area they decided not  
5 to ask for 92 per cent of the representatives but only  
6 50 per cent at any one time. So while we have 55  
7 members freely appointed by the government, the  
8 chairman is appointed by the government and two members  
9 of parliament appointed, of the remaining 52 Metro-  
10 politan Toronto has 26. At any time if an outside  
11 municipality obtains another member, Metropolitan  
12 Toronto automatically obtains a member.

13 I feel that had Metro at that time insisted  
14 on representation by population they would have swamped  
15 the Authority to the point where the borough municipi-  
16 palities would have felt completely outnumbered.

17 Then the other strength of the Authority  
18 movement getting people on the watersheds working for  
19 it is the method of financing, which is 50 per cent  
20 by the municipalities and 50 per cent by the Province  
21 of Ontario. But until the municipalities agree to  
22 spend one dollar the government will not spend a  
23 dollar; so the work of all these Authorities in the  
24 province is not of even calibre. If an Authority  
25 cannot get its people enthused it will not do any  
26 work.

27 Here I might say, sir, in this great  
28 Metropolitan area we have had the support of Metro  
29 and the municipalities. We have been able to achieve  
30 quite a bit.







1 Another strength of the movement -- and  
2 this the American people envy and I have this brought  
3 to my attention constantly -- is our overall juris-  
4 diction. This is very important. This is one reason  
5 why we are interested in the investigation you are  
6 carrying on. We have jurisdiction over land use and  
7 forest stations on the entire 1,000 square miles and  
8 recreation in connection with this. In that connec-  
9 tion the lands we obtain within Metropolitan Toronto  
10 we turn over to the Metropolitan Parks Committee. It  
11 is interesting to note that of their 6,000 acres the  
12 Authority owns 5,000 acres roughly.

13 We have jurisdiction over flood control --  
14 I will mention that just quickly in a moment -- and  
15 some thought to wildlife in the community, fish,  
16 birds and so on.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say, Dr. Lord,  
18 that you hand over the parks in the Metropolitan area  
19 to the Metropolitan Parks Department, do you mean you  
20 retain ownership?

21 DR. LORD: We retain ownership, sir, and  
22 we turn it over to them for a nominal fee. We lease  
23 it to them indefinitely and they carry out the recrea-  
24 tional development, park development, subject to our  
25 approval. In the agreement we have jurisdiction over  
26 all the flood control features and we actually con-  
27 struct anything in the river that is necessary for  
28 flood control.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: You also said that you  
30 have control over land use. What kind of control?







1 DR. LORD: Could I amplify that, sir?

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Please.

3 DR. LORD: I am just coming to that. This,  
4 I would submit, is one of the great strengths here --  
5 something that the people in the United States envy  
6 us for very much. I think it is one of our big  
7 points. We have control of the use of the flood  
8 claim lands.

9 In the United States they found that they  
10 have so many agencies doing the work that we are doing  
11 and they lack the control of these flood claim lands,  
12 with the result that often on a big watershed they will  
13 spend millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of  
14 dollars building big dams and then have the municipi-  
15 palities down below proceed to re-zone former flood  
16 claim lands for use. The result is that often in  
17 15 or 20 years' time the flood control has been nulli-  
18 fied and it is very frustrating to them.

19  
20  
21 -

22  
23  
24 -

25  
26  
27 -

28  
29  
30 -





1 Now here, through the Act we have, fill  
2 regulations are possible through our Authority. They  
3 have to be approved by the government, and up until  
4 recently we had regulations which permitted us to  
5 control the dumping of fill and building of buildings  
6 above the flood line. We have marked this flood line  
7 on all our watersheds by taking aerial surveys and  
8 marking them, but we found that was not good enough,  
9 sir, because we felt we must control the valley to  
10 the top of the slope for various reasons. If you  
11 break into a slope by building, you have erosion and  
12 other difficulties taking place, so we have now gone  
13 further and by a change in the Act we are empowered  
14 to lay down plans, limits within which we can have  
15 something to say about the fill and building.

16 We have now placed on a series of some  
17 300 maps this line at the top of the slope, and that,  
18 sir, is one of the most powerful things an Authority  
19 can have. That permits us to control the use of the  
20 valley lands. I might say we have had excellent  
21 cooperation from the various planning boards with us  
22 on that.

23 Our flood control plan is very interesting,  
24 and I would like to point out one of the big reasons  
25 why we thought that this was necessary. As you may  
26 know, sir, in Hurricane Hazel which happened here --  
27 a very unfortunate happening which gave impetus to  
28 this flood control -- 81 persons were drowned, \$25  
29 million worth of damage in one night, and I have often  
30 said to people that something else happened there that







1 the layman does not very often realize, and that is that  
2 our rivers from the head waters to the lake, although  
3 they are only fifty miles long maximum, have a tre-  
4 mendous fall of about 1,200 feet. In Hurricane Hazel  
5 the discharge from the little Humber river was about  
6 half the flow over Niagara Falls, 55,000 cubic feet a  
7 second.

8 Now, you know, sir, at Niagara Falls with  
9 165 feet of drop they develop 2,000,000 horsepower  
10 there. I made a very rough estimate that in Hurricane  
11 Hazel there was 2,000,000 horsepower of power developed  
12 on the Humber River and that is the reason roads,  
13 streets and everything were torn up, and there is one  
14 good reason why the Conservation Authority felt that  
15 they could not permit a similar flood to take place  
16 in this rapidly expanding municipality, and so we have  
17 the flood control scheme.

18 We are building 16 dams and carrying out  
19 other things. We are acquiring flood claims land  
20 and keeping them in parkland and so on. We have  
21 had excellent cooperation with the Metropolitan  
22 departments and we have done this through technical,  
23 parks and conservation committees, and all the matters  
24 connected with development, roads and so on as they  
25 may affect the valleys, channel improvements, sewers,  
26 trunk sewers and so on are discussed in a preliminary  
27 way so that you don't have such things happening as  
28 a sewer being put through one of our reservoir areas  
29 and so on. We are getting good cooperation there.

30 Also with the Metropolitan Authorities, on





1 their water front advisory and technical committee, the  
2 Authority is represented there and we are getting  
3 excellent cooperation in that regard.

4 In our brief, sir, we point out three main  
5 areas in which we are interested in this big metropolli-  
6 tan picture. First of all, as I have suggested to you,  
7 we are interested in some overall control of conserva-  
8 tion matters. This is right at the last of con-  
9 clusions and recommendations. We feel that as  
10 indicated to you, that in the United States they failed  
11 in some of these things, and an Authority such as ours  
12 must, by some means, achieve coordinated control.

13 We are tremendously interested in the water  
14 quality, prevention of pollution. We can indicate that  
15 to you, sir, by just one reference: we are just com-  
16 pleting our Clearville dam on the west bank of the  
17 Humber which will be opening this year, and while  
18 that dam is primarily for flood control, there will  
19 be a 160-acre lake connected with it, a permanent  
20 lake, and about 1,000 acres of contiguous land. As  
21 a secondary but very important use, that will be a  
22 wonderful recreational facility.

23 We, therefore, have become tremendously  
24 interested in the matter of pollution because obviously  
25 if this water -- people can swim in it -- but in a  
26 development in this big municipality if some thought  
27 is not given to pollution, that great expenditure and  
28 wonderful facility would be nullified.

29 Therefore we have -- I think, sir, you  
30 have a copy of our pollution report -- made an attempt







1 which I believe is an honest first attempt to deal with  
2 this matter of pollution, and I might say that the  
3 Metropolitan Planning Board, the Metropolitan Works  
4 Committee and many of the area municipalities have  
5 agreed to this plan, and we are presenting it to all  
6 the others. We have taken it to their councils,  
7 and presented it one by one.

8 In Item 3, the Authority is concerned with  
9 the fact that certain of the headwater municipalities  
10 are drained by watersheds which go through Metropolitan  
11 Toronto. We feel that some method should be found  
12 whereby there is some control on what these municipali-  
13 ties can do with the upstream watershed. We are  
14 trying to achieve this now on a voluntary basis, but  
15 we would like some better control.

16 Finally, and this may be odd, sir, but by  
17 the very fact we own so many of the vacant spaces in  
18 the recreational areas and the valley lands which appear  
19 to everyone as logical places to put garbage, we  
20 have become tremendously interested in what is done  
21 with the waste and garbage in this big Metropolitan  
22 area. We believe there are certain areas which can  
23 be used, but we think that the Metropolitan Works  
24 Department should have the disposal of this, and we  
25 are now working out plans with them to try to designate  
26 such areas so that this may be taken care of properly  
27 in the future.

28 That, sir, is very briefly our jurisdiction  
29 and our interest in what you are doing.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Adjoining







1 your Authority is the Port Credit?

2 DR. LORD: Yes, the Credit valley.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Credit Valley Authority.

4 Is there any conflict there?

5 DR. LORD: No, there isn't. There is  
6 no conflict at all between our Authorities because  
7 these Authorities dealing on a watershed basis, it is  
8 surprising how many things are tied up with the river.  
9 You see none of our water drains into their water-  
10 shed.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: The Credit River?

12 DR. LORD: That is a separate river.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: So that you would not  
14 expect or ask that your Authority be extended to in-  
15 clude that area?

16 DR. LORD: That question has been brought  
17 up, sir. We really haven't considered it. Should  
18 Metropolitan Toronto be extended then I think the  
19 question would be open for consideration.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You suggest that the  
21 jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area  
22 should be extended to include certain municipalities  
23 or portions of municipalities which are within the  
24 drainage basins that affect the Metropolitan munici-  
25 pality and its planning area?

26 DR. LORD: Yes. Rather than stating it  
27 in that way, we found after we wrote that that naturally  
28 some of the northern areas took exception to that  
29 recommendation.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: I would have thought so.





1 DR. LORD: And I promised to say to you  
2 that we are not recommending that the Metropolitan  
3 Planning Area be extended to that extent, but that  
4 some means be found or some overall jurisdiction to  
5 regulate the disposal of waste and so on into the  
6 rivers.

7 Now, if that could only be done through  
8 extending the Metropolitan Planning Board, then I am  
9 afraid I would have to say something like that should  
10 be done. However, we did create a little bit of  
11 opposition by bringing that in from some of our  
12 northern constituents.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say by pro-  
14 cess of elimination that it should be extended, that  
15 this jurisdiction should be extended to include  
16 Brampton and Chinguacousy Township in any way?

17 DR. LORD: Possibly Brampton. I am not  
18 so sure about all of Chinguacousy.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say Brampton  
20 do you include Bramalea?

21 DR. LORD: Yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I have been interested  
23 in reading your brief and listening to the work which  
24 is being done. I know that it is a special case  
25 really.

26 DR. LORD: Yes, it is.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: In the North American  
28 experience.

29 DR. LORD: Yes.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,







1 Dr. Lord. We will now adjourn until tomorrow at  
2 ten o'clock.

3  
4 ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned until Wednesday,  
5 May 13th, 1964, at 10.00 a.m.

---



# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

HELD AT  
PARLIAMENT BUILDING,  
TORONTO

VOLUME No. 1 DATE:

11

MAY 13, 1964.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383





1  
2  
3 ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
4  
5

6 Hearings of the Royal Commission  
7 on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
8 the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
9 Ontario, on Wednesday, May 13th,  
10 1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.,  
11 et seq.  
12  
13  
14

15 PRESENT:

16 H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C. Commissioner

17 F. H. Finnis Secretary  
18

19 L. Feldman Research Officer

20 T. Plunkett Municipal Consultant  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

CENTRAL ONTARIO CHAPTER OF THE TOWN  
PLANNING INSTITUTE OF CANADA

990 - 1026

URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE,  
ONTARIO DIVISION

1027 - 1047

E. COMAY, Esq.

1048 - 1113

\* \* \* \* \*





SUBMISSION OF  
CENTRAL  
ONTARIO CHAPTER OF THE TOWN  
PLANNING INSTITUTE OF  
CANADA

---

Appearance:

Mr. M. J. Bacon

---

THE COMMISSIONER: The Central Ontario  
Chapter of the Town Planning Institute of Canada.

MR. BACON: Good morning, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: You must like it here,  
Mr. Bacon.

MR. BACON: Yes. As regards the brief  
from the Central Ontario Chapter, which was prepared  
as you can see by a committee of the executive, I do  
not think that there is any point, in view of the fact  
that I know you have read the brief rather carefully,  
in repeating all of it, but I would like to touch on  
some of the highlights and would be very happy to  
answer any questions, which I hope you have, sir.

The points which we raise generally fall  
into three general fields. The first is the relation-  
ship of the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan  
Toronto Planning Board to the constituent municipali-  
ties in the two areas of jurisdiction, the first being,  
of course, the Metropolitan area -- the municipality --  
and the other one the planning area. The second  
general field is the extent of the Metropolitan







1 municipality and the planning area. The third field  
2 is the question of planning in the region surrounding  
3 the Metropolitan planning area.

4 In connection with the first point it would  
5 appear in the transportation field, sir, the prodigious  
6 growth in car ownership necessitated some drastic  
7 measures and by and large Metro has been able to  
8 construct the major facilities which are necessary  
9 and have started on an excellent subway system through-  
10 out the area.

11 But while the two basic necessities are  
12 proceeding fairly rapidly there is some considerable  
13 concern in respect to the minor parts of the spider's  
14 web of the transportation system in the suburban areas,  
15 which are the responsibility of the local municipali-  
16 ties. Metro has not been able to ensure either  
17 through its own efforts or by guiding constituent  
18 municipalities a satisfactory network of local or  
19 arterial roads.

20 In the field of public transportation, sir,  
21 as I said, the subway system is proceeding compara-  
22 tively rapidly, but the situation in the suburbs in  
23 respect to surface transportation is far less satis-  
24 factory and there are some areas where perhaps real  
25 inadequacies can be pointed out. One of these, we  
26 believe, has a distinct relationship to the fact that  
27 the Municipality of Metropolitan Act stipulates that  
28 the TTC must be self-sufficient and while the Metro-  
29 politan Council has found a way to subsidize the  
30 capital costs of construction, this very subsidization





1 of capital costs may unbalance the system in other  
2 respects, because it cannot directly subsidize the  
3 perhaps uneconomic parts which should be provided  
4 of the total system.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you develop that  
6 a little further? I had a question mark opposite  
7 the statement.

8 MR. BACON: It is our understanding, sir,  
9 that the Act requires the TTC to be self-sufficient,  
10 to pay its way. It obviously cannot.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I was referring to  
12 your comments on the financing of capital costs. You  
13 say the assumption by the Metro Council of some of  
14 the capital costs may lead to an unbalanced system.

15 MR. BACON: What we meant by this was,  
16 sir, that if the capital costs only of such things as  
17 one part of the transportation system -- i.e., the  
18 subway -- are paid for or partly paid for by the  
19 Metropolitan Council but they have full power under  
20 the Act to subsidize the operational part of, say,  
21 a bus route which, because of a centralized area is  
22 bound to be inefficient or not self-sufficient because  
23 there are four miles between for one reason or another  
24 this area that needs service; they cannot do it. So  
25 the one may get an imbalance -- a very efficient  
26 perhaps paying system on the subway in the central  
27 parts and a very expensive and unsubsidizable and  
28 perhaps therefore rather skeleton system in the  
29 suburbs.

30 We cannot obviously be in a position to





1 make definite statements about this, but this is as much  
2 as we know at the present time and I think it would  
3 need exhaustive studies to find out how far this might  
4 unbalance it or might not.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You are just pointing  
6 to a possibility?

7 MR. BACON: Yes, sir, that may exist at  
8 the moment. But of course we have not the statistical  
9 evidence to support this.

10 The second thing in this regard which  
11 concerns the Institute is the fact that while the  
12 expansion of the Metropolitan facilities is proceeding  
13 at a pace there is not yet a master plan for the  
14 Metropolitan area. We feel that there must be some  
15 doubt as to its likely effectiveness under the present  
16 Metropolitan system where constituent municipalities  
17 are not required to carry out work in an official  
18 plan or a transportation plan.

19 All they are required to do under the Act  
20 at the present time is not to carry out work that might  
21 conflict with any plan, and this rather negative  
22 control we feel may be a seriously inhibiting factor  
23 under the present Metropolitan system to the accom-  
24 plishment of a complete transportation network of roads  
25 throughout the Metropolitan area.

26 So there are two points which we feel  
27 concerned about. We recognize that the Metropolitan  
28 Planning Board are working at top speed on the Metro-  
29 politan master plan for roads within the Metropolitan  
30 area -- that is, the Metropolitan Planning Area -- and







1 a start has been made on a Metropolitan regional study  
2 by the province. But we feel this concern even  
3 when these are completed, and it may be some time  
4 before the total plan is complete. We feel some  
5 concern but it may not be implemented.

6 The whole question of implementation of  
7 any plan or the building of the minor network within  
8 the basic system provided by Metropolitan Toronto  
9 itself is a complex one. Roads are assumed and  
10 others are not, which is of necessity under the  
11 present political system. There certainly appears  
12 to us to have been some hesitancy on the part of  
13 local municipalities to spend the quite considerable  
14 sums needed in some instances to bridge large ravines  
15 or indeed to provide major collector streets at mid-  
16 block points north or south or east or west.

17 One gets a situation in Scarborough where  
18 the concession roads are close together and do therefore  
19 provide an excellent north-south route, but in North  
20 York the blocks are twice as large and yet very few  
21 of them have a good mid-block collector system within  
22 them. Added to this are the ravines which often  
23 go or usually go diagonally across these things --  
24 the concession blocks -- and the minor transportation  
25 system or road network is extremely inefficient and  
26 very difficult to navigate around in many parts of  
27 the northern section of the area.

28 We feel that the fact that the sums needed  
29 to accomplish or build such a system may have been a  
30 very considerable part of -- may have occasioned the





1 hesitancy on the part of the municipalities. Metro-  
2 politan jurisdiction over all of the major roads within  
3 the area at least would methinks improve the situation  
4 considerably.

5 We recognize that there would be some  
6 objection that local pet projects -- and perhaps "pet"  
7 is not the word -- but local projects which had a high  
8 priority might slide to a lower priority if Metro-  
9 politan Toronto took over the whole lot; but we do  
10 suggest the benefits to the community as a whole of  
11 having an integrated system built in an integrated  
12 manner of the total major transportation routes would  
13 well outweigh the disadvantages to local inhabitants  
14 of some local project being given a lower priority.

15 The second point which I would like to  
16 highlight ---

17 THE COMMISSIONER: That is, you would  
18 transfer to Metro the jurisdiction over all roads?

19 MR. BACON: Well, we say later in the  
20 brief, sir, that we feel that there is no real reason  
21 that we can see why there should not be total amalga-  
22 mation. However, if there is not, as a minimum all  
23 the major roads should become a Metropolitan respon-  
24 sibility -- not all the roads, sir, because small sub-  
25 division cul-de-sac and loop roads, and so on, could  
26 not become part of the Metropolitan system unless  
27 there is total amalgamation, which we think is a good  
28 thing anyway.

29 In respect to housing we would note that  
30 the number of public housing units built in Canada







1 since the war has been extraordinarily small and that  
2 certainly in Metropolitan Toronto, while our percentage  
3 of the total number built in Canada is very large, the  
4 picture is far from satisfactory.

5 We would suggest, if I may quote a short  
6 paragraph: "There will undoubtedly need to be a greatly  
7 increased effort made in the future to ameliorate the  
8 housing shortage for the substantial number of people  
9 in need of subsidized or other forms of public housing.  
10 Estimates of the number in this position vary widely  
11 between 30,000 and 100,000" -- depending on where  
12 one draws the line.

13 The private sector of the economy have  
14 been responsible for the bulk of development in the  
15 postwar years. Perhaps I may briefly skim over this  
16 part, sir, because I know that it will be dealt with  
17 in greater detail by others. But we do feel very  
18 strongly that the position of the municipalities in  
19 the past has been that because the private sector has  
20 in effect footed very largely the bill for the construc-  
21 tion, and in fact has incurred an increasingly large  
22 proportion of the construction not only of roads  
23 within subdivisions but outside subdivisions in terms  
24 of contributions towards trunk facilities, that any  
25 building of low-cost housing by the private sector  
26 means the municipalities have either got to help them  
27 by decreasing their prices to the developer or the  
28 municipality has in fact got to build all the roads  
29 perhaps and the private developer just build the  
30 housing units -- or some sharing arrangement.





1 Under the present taxation system in the  
2 area this is, we feel, going to meet with a considerable  
3 amount of opposition. We have seen examples of the  
4 large projects in the Metropolitan area grinding almost  
5 to a halt in the recent past. We feel that obviously  
6 some sympathy must be felt for the municipalities be-  
7 cause they are in a difficult position from a taxation  
8 point of view.

9 Housing in the lower price range has generally  
10 speaking produced the highest number of children per  
11 household and the taxes received from those houses are  
12 in the lower range. So based on education grounds and  
13 possibly on the loss of contributions from developers  
14 in the construction of roads, utilities and contri-  
15 butions towards major facilities, there may well be  
16 opposition from constituent municipalities.

17 We think that there is an increasing demand  
18 for an overall housing authority which would coordinate  
19 the total housing policy for the lower income groups and  
20 that the allocation of these units and the financing of  
21 them in terms of the payment of school costs and so on  
22 can really only logically be done on a Metropolitan  
23 basis.

24 We do not suggest, in summary of this sec-  
25 tion, sir, that those functions now under Metropolitan  
26 jurisdiction for all purposes are perhaps perfect, but  
27 we do suggest that by and large they are more efficient  
28 and more uniform in quality in some respects and better  
29 coordinated from a Metropolitan standpoint than those  
30 where jurisdiction is divided or is solely on a local





1 basis. This is obviously a broad generalization but  
2 we feel certainly in the fields we have mentioned that  
3 this is fairly true, sir.

4 We suggest that many of the problems  
5 inherent in the present system would evaporate if there  
6 were only one government for the whole existing Metro-  
7 politan municipality.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not talking of  
9 housing alone there, are you?

10 MR. BACON: No, sir. In terms of trans-  
11 portation, which I mentioned, at least all the major  
12 and collector roads we feel certainly should be under  
13 Metropolitan jurisdiction, and certainly housing should  
14 be under Metropolitan jurisdiction.

15 There are a number of other functions which  
16 could, we feel, be more efficiently and better handled,  
17 and we come to some of these points in terms of the  
18 Official Plan, zoning bylaws, building bylaws and so on  
19 later in the brief.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting that  
21 the set-up here on housing is in large part responsible  
22 for the backlog of public housing; is that right?

23 MR. BACON: Not necessarily but it is in  
24 large part responsible for it, sir, because there are  
25 other, I think, social factors. Perhaps there has  
26 not been too great a recognition on the part of the  
27 public generally to build public housing.

28 The whole question of the relationship  
29 of income to the need for public housing, the need for  
30 government subsidy and so on, this is a general problem,







1 I think, that we are gradually coming into. I think  
2 it is certainly aggravated by the fact that the municipi-  
3 palities where the land is at a reasonable price to  
4 be purchased for low-cost or low-rent housing are in  
5 the suburbs and the difficult financial plight in  
6 respect to taxes and education of many of the suburbs --  
7 it would be aggravated by this problem, which has cer-  
8 tainly been an inhibiting factor.

9 But I do not think perhaps one could go as  
10 far as to say this is the largest single cause, although  
11 it could be, sir, yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You have admitted that  
13 public housing is a problem right across Canada?

14 MR. BACON: Right.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Actually you said in  
16 your brief that the units constructed in Toronto are a  
17 very large percentage of the total number of public  
18 housing units in Canada.

19 MR. BACON: Right.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you blame Metro  
21 for the situation throughout Canada?

22 MR. BACON: No, not at all, sir. We in  
23 fact patted them on the back by saying that the percen-  
24 tage that they have built is a very large proportion  
25 of those in Canada. There are two other really big,  
26 comparatively large housing schemes, one in the east  
27 and one in the west, that have been built. Of course,  
28 Toronto has three really comparatively large ones,  
29 the Lawrence Heights and the two parts of Regent Park,  
30 and of course Moss Park going up now, which are very





1 substantial additions in this field.

2 But these are all on very expensive land  
3 and it has cost a great deal to build them. There is  
4 a need for public housing -- or low-cost housing at  
5 least -- in other parts of the Metropolitan area, as  
6 the Metropolitan Land Use Plan clearly shows that  
7 there will be employment places in many sectors of  
8 the Metropolitan Area.

9 I think it is unrealistic to expect that  
10 all those people working in the factories are going to  
11 be able to live in single family detached houses which  
12 they purchase from N.H.A. The facts are that they  
13 just cannot afford to. Therefore there should be some  
14 low-rent housing in various sectors of the Metropolitan  
15 area and, for the reasons that we point out in the brief,  
16 there is going to be or is likely to be opposition  
17 largely on financial grounds rather than social grounds  
18 from the municipalities in which the public housing is  
19 proposed.

20 We have seen the hassle of three levels of  
21 government that went on for some time in Etobicoke  
22 recently. We think that this is undesirable and  
23 there should be a rational approach to this. That  
24 way something can in fact be done. The easiest way  
25 and the best way to approach it appears to be on a  
26 Metro-wide basis under a Metropolitan Authority.  
27 This means the sharing of the financial problems, which  
28 can best be done on a Metropolitan level by perhaps  
29 amalgamation, or certainly an amalgamation of financial  
30 resources.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: But the same problem  
2 of public housing exists in an exaggerated form, does  
3 it not, in cities, in big cities which have amalgama-  
4 tion in Canada? You have estimated there is this  
5 lack in Toronto under the Metropolitan system, but it  
6 has gone farther than other cities in Canada.

7  
8  
9 -

10  
11  
12  
13 -

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 -

19  
20  
21  
22 -

23  
24  
25  
26 -





1 MR. BACON: This is true, sir, but if we  
2 take, for instance, the problem in Saint John, New  
3 Brunswick, which I know you are probably a good deal  
4 more familiar with than I am, if one takes the per  
5 capita income and the tax per capita in that city and  
6 the same for Toronto I think the average, which is in  
7 fact represented by the upper section, is pulled up  
8 by the upper section of the income per capita and would  
9 enable Toronto to do a great deal more in this respect  
10 than Saint John because the average is quite a bit  
11 lower in Saint John than in Toronto.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think you can  
13 compare Saint John with Toronto.

14 MR. BACON: It would be easier for  
15 Toronto with its comparative wealth to do this. In  
16 many ways I think they have done better than most other  
17 people and they could do better. It has been esti-  
18 mated by the Planning Board they should do more in the  
19 public housing field. It has been such a complicated  
20 affair in the past, not only because there are three  
21 levels of government involved but also because there  
22 was an understandable opposition to it on financial  
23 grounds from municipalities in the suburbs. I think  
24 this has been a really inhibiting factor in financial  
25 terms and in terms of time. There has been a year  
26 or more in time when an estimated thousand units  
27 should be built. That is considerable.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I agree with you that  
29 there should be a far more simplified machinery. What  
30 about the Ontario Housing Corporation which is now being





1 set up under legislation? Will that help solve the  
2 problem?

3 MR. BACON: Well again I am not entirely  
4 familiar with the Bill or Act, sir, but I think it  
5 should certainly assist in it and assist in the speeding  
6 up of the process. How far it can assist in the other  
7 matters, particularly for the financial picture, I  
8 don't know, sir. As I say, I am not familiar with  
9 the content of the Bill.

10 There may be, again relating to recent  
11 legislation, some assistance in cleaning up older  
12 houses and providing a minimum standard in existing  
13 houses from the awkward sections of the Planning Act,  
14 which were recently passed by the Legislature. Of  
15 course, they may not come into effect for a little  
16 while. This may assist although the powers given  
17 under that are not as strong as they might have been.  
18 I think these two things will help. I think the  
19 basic thing is financial. This is the crux of the  
20 matter really.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: There are two problems.  
22 There is finance and the complex machinery.

23 MR. BACON: Right, sir. Having said that  
24 we think that most of the matters that are under Metro-  
25 politan function are well handled conversely we cannot  
26 find any major function which might be better adminis-  
27 tered on a local rather than a total area basis. In  
28 this we bear in mind the fact Metro is comparatively  
29 small as cities go. It is less than two million now  
30 and won't be more than three million until about the







1 turn of the century. It is not that big a unit to be  
2 dealing with.

3 Undoubtedly the detailed consideration of  
4 local matters is now afforded by municipal councils and  
5 it takes up a great deal of their time. This could  
6 not be continued in a Metropolitan council. We  
7 realize this is an argument which is frequently used.

8 We are, however, inclined to the view that  
9 such problems could rightly be handled by area com-  
10 mittees of Metropolitan councils or by a number of  
11 other methods; even perhaps a borough system which is  
12 part of the Metropolitan system. No system would  
13 need to perpetuate the proliferation of semi-independent  
14 councils, boards and commissions which now attempt to  
15 run municipal business in the Metropolitan area.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: When you suggest the  
17 possibility of area committees of Metropolitan Council  
18 dealing with local problems are you thinking in terms  
19 of elected committees?

20 MR. BACON: Oh, yes, sir. I am speaking  
21 personally as I have not canvassed the other members.  
22 I am very strongly in favour of things being done by  
23 elected committees. The fewer boards and commissions  
24 one has the better. It is sort of a circle; the  
25 more the council has to do the more policy it deals  
26 with and the more delegation of the minor matters it  
27 gives to its civil servants the more responsibility  
28 it feels it has and the more responsibility in fact  
29 it will accept.

30 Perhaps I am prejudiced having worked in





1 another country where this was in fact the case. One  
2 gets a very high standard of politician generally  
3 speaking and a very high standard of civil servant.  
4 Both have to accept a fair amount of responsibility  
5 and this is a two-edge thing and it goes on.

6 At the present time it is possible to  
7 hedge almost any question. It is possible to say that  
8 board and this commission did raise the taxes; or  
9 "X" forces that decision on us. Passing of the  
10 problems is heavy with a proliferation of boards and  
11 commissions. We think elected representatives  
12 should set the policy and in fact run the place with  
13 able and conscientious servants.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: When you suggest the  
15 abolition of some independent councils, boards and  
16 commissions and so on, do you include there the  
17 local planning boards? Would you replace the planning  
18 board by a committee of council?

19 MR. BACON: Yes, I would indeed, sir.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I said the local plan-  
21 ning board. Would that not apply to the Metropolitan  
22 Planning Board?

23 MR. BACON: Under the present system, sir,  
24 where the Metropolitan planning area extends a great  
25 deal farther, almost twice, 26 as against 13, outside  
26 the Metropolitan Corporation, I think this would be  
27 unfair and unworkable. It would be quite unjust,  
28 in my view, for there to be no representation. I  
29 think there is a good reason to suggest that there  
30 should be greater representation on the existing Metro







1 Planning Board by the constituent municipalities.

2 This does not mean to say I think the  
3 number of municipalities in the same area is the right  
4 number or a very meaningful planning or political unit.  
5 Under the present system where they have no councils  
6 I think there is very good reason to suggest they  
7 should have representation on the planning board if  
8 the present system is kept. We say later on we don't  
9 think it should be.

10 I think that it would be unfair and unwise  
11 to do away with the Metropolitan Planning Board but on  
12 the local level, assuming amalgamation, I think the  
13 planning boards would be quite unnecessary. I think  
14 there is good reason to say that where a municipality  
15 has a good staff that planning should be directly the  
16 responsibility of Council, and the more Council does  
17 the more it forms policies and lets the staff ad-  
18 minister within those clearly defined policies.

19 I think again this reverts back to our  
20 whole question that there should be a plan and it  
21 should be adopted so that not only the citizen knows  
22 but the politician knows, the head of department  
23 knows what the policies are. Everybody can see  
24 them. They are clear to the world.

25 The plan will obviously need amending  
26 from time to time. I think it might be well to have  
27 this in the Planning Act. There should be a review.  
28 This is not at all unusual. In most European countries  
29 this is required. I think it should be clearly recog-  
30 nized it is going to have to change; probably not in





1 any major detail unless there are some major techno-  
2 logical changes that we have no idea about.

3 Under those circumstances we recommend  
4 the abolition of the Planning Board. We recommend  
5 it although I personally in writing another report in  
6 respect to North York recommended legislation should  
7 be introduced to allow the municipality to dispense  
8 with the Planning Board and assume its functions.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the McDonald-  
10 Currier Report?

11 MR. BACON: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I wanted your reaction.

13 MR. BACON: My reaction is in the report.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I wanted it for my  
15 record.

16 MR. BACON: Do you want me to enlarge  
17 on that?

18 THE COMMISSIONER: No, it is all right.

19 MR. BACON: In respect to this, of course,  
20 one step has already been taken and that is the amend-  
21 ments to the Planning Act passed by the Legislature  
22 and consents, which are an important part of the work  
23 of many planning boards, under Section 26 are assumed  
24 by the Committee of Adjustment. That is one of the  
25 functions recommended in that report. I think it is  
26 very reasonable. It not only overcomes this problem  
27 of time taken by the Planning Board in this matter but  
28 it overcomes many other problems. There is the ques-  
29 tion of appeal other than application under Section 26.

30 Although there are minor points in this I







1 think this is an excellent step forward, we hope it is,  
2 towards that other end.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I must say I was im-  
4 pressed by the recommendations in that report.

5 MR. BACON: Thank you. Now the next  
6 point I would like to deal with, sir, is the question  
7 of area identification. We are inclined to the view  
8 that most citizens are hardly aware of the municipality  
9 in which they reside. It is true they get a tax  
10 bill from it but our feeling is that if somebody is  
11 away from town and someone says "Where do you live?"  
12 the chances are they will not say "I live in New  
13 Toronto." They will say "I live in Toronto". They  
14 may say, as we have suggested here, that they live in  
15 Toronto and then they will suggest the section of it.

16 By and large the majority of citizens  
17 consider themselves part of Metropolitan Toronto and  
18 the community and neighbourhood in which they live,  
19 such as Parkdale, Lawrence Park, Don Mills, Flemingdon  
20 Park, Alderwood and West Hill and so on.

21 It is interesting to note that the federal  
22 government, through the Postmaster General, considers  
23 a very large part of the area as Toronto. It, however,  
24 does give names to some of the small sections of the  
25 area which have some real identification, such as  
26 Willowdale, Islington, and so on. Only two of the  
27 municipalities apart from Toronto in the Metropolitan  
28 area have names in the postal district. You cannot  
29 address a letter to Scarborough for most of Scarborough  
30 or Etobicoke or North York because there is not a







1 postal district. It is the same with the Bell  
2 Telephone Company.

3 There is, we feel, a small identification  
4 with the municipality as such. We suggest in the  
5 conclusion of this section that the average citizen,  
6 as opposed to a small minority who have some par-  
7 ticular interest in perpetuating local municipal  
8 governments, would be perfectly happy to find them-  
9 selves a resident of Toronto as opposed to one of the  
10 present municipalities; providing, of course, his  
11 tax contribution was not substantially increased  
12 thereby.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you attempted to  
14 estimate the financial effect of amalgamation?

15 MR. BACON: No, sir. We did submit  
16 a brief to the Committee on Taxation and a large part  
17 of this was concerned with this Metropolitan problem  
18 but we haven't had the time or the facilities with  
19 which to investigate the problem, sir.

20 The next question we would like to deal  
21 with briefly is the question of official plans. It  
22 is hoped that the Metropolitan Official Plan, or a  
23 very large part of it, will be completed in the very  
24 near future and that the constituent municipalities in  
25 the area will make reasonable and constructive comments  
26 thereon and that the plan will be adopted.

27 Under the present system there are a  
28 number of official plans in the area adopted by muni-  
29 cipalities, most in fact in the Metropolitan planning  
30 area, but we suggest most of these plans really are





1 not terribly good ones and they don't do very much.  
2 There are notable exceptions. Parts of the city have  
3 been covered by excellent plans, such as the Rosedale  
4 plan and so on. Most of them do little more than  
5 designate general areas of land use and have some  
6 policies.

7 The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto  
8 Act theoretically ensures the conformance of local  
9 official plans with the Metropolitan plan once it is  
10 adopted but it does not ensure the implementation of  
11 any part of the plan. We consider this a serious  
12 shortcoming.

13 I think one can assume that Metro would do  
14 its part. Its record has been extraordinarily good.  
15 This is not true of other areas even where policy  
16 has been suggested. For various reasons it might  
17 not be possible to carry them out. The Metropolitan  
18 staff has been able to carry out adequate research  
19 and produce, albeit after a great deal of time, a  
20 pretty good plan. It is likely that it is reasonable  
21 and realistic and could be implemented but there is no  
22 guarantee that it would be by local municipalities.

23 The second problem is the question of  
24 district plans which is proposed in the Metropolitan  
25 Official Plan. This may create a horrifying hier-  
26 archy of plans if district plans were adopted and  
27 then there remain existing plans. In the case of  
28 Scarborough this would be a tremendous problem because  
29 they have an overall secondary plan and with a secondary  
30 plan and a tertiary plan you would get five plans in







1 the area, all of which might be affected by the Metro-  
2 politan Official Plan. It would be quite a knot to  
3 untie to make any amendment.

4  
5  
6 -

7  
8  
9  
10  
11 -

12  
13  
14  
15 -

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 -

21  
22  
23  
24 -





1           This problem of the adoption of a plan  
2 of course is also one with which we are concerned,  
3 which I mentioned earlier in respect to the abolition  
4 of the Metropolitan Planning Board. Once a plan  
5 is determined, I think there is understandable fear  
6 on the part of some parties within the planning area  
7 that Metro may be guiding development not in the right  
8 way for them, or it may do them some harm.

9           I do not think there is any indication  
10 or any justification that we know of for this view,  
11 but I think it is a very understandable fear because  
12 the Metropolitan Council just hasn't the responsibility  
13 to those outside councils, and even in their plan  
14 understandably they may be influenced more with inside  
15 the Metropolitan area than outside.

16           THE COMMISSIONER: Are you suggesting here  
17 that a series of district plans would not work?

18           MR. BACON: I think they would work, sir,  
19 but I think that one would have<sup>to</sup>/in most cases abolish  
20 the overall plan for that municipality, in the case,  
21 for instance, of North York.

22           THE COMMISSIONER: Just to save time you  
23 are recommending now what you recommend in that North  
24 York report?

25           MR. BACON: Yes.

26           THE COMMISSIONER: That is the Metropolitan  
27 Official Plan with subsidiary district plans?

28           MR. BACON: That is right.

29           THE COMMISSIONER: And eliminating the  
30 present municipal plan?





1 MR. BACON: Right.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?

3 MR. BACON: Even when the plan is adopted  
4 we stress the need for effective measures to ensure  
5 implementation of the Metropolitan Official Plan. If  
6 it is to cover areas which are outside the Metropolitan  
7 political jurisdiction, that is, the municipalities,  
8 then there should be equally effective measures to  
9 ensure its implementation there.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: What measures do you  
11 suggest?

12 MR. BACON: Well, we did suggest in the  
13 recommendations at the end some of these measures, sir.  
14 For instance, that uniform zoning standards -- which  
15 is a sort of by-product, but it ensures the thing is  
16 workable -- that the Official Plan be implemented by  
17 district plans and subsequently zoning bylaws within  
18 two to three years -- specified period of time--not  
19 only to pass an official plan to conform to the  
20 Metropolitan Official Plan but also to pass zoning  
21 bylaws which make sure it is implemented.

22 One might go so far as to -- I would think  
23 this would be desirable although whether it is possible  
24 is another matter -- to ensure that the capital works  
25 budget of the fringe municipalities do in fact  
26 implement the Metropolitan Official Plan because at  
27 the moment as long as they don't contravene it --  
28 this might mean considerably more financial study on  
29 the part of Metropolitan Council before the plan is  
30 adopted, but I think this would be the only real way







1 to ensure that the plan was workable, and that it did  
2 in fact become a reality.

3 In respect to schools, for instance, the  
4 Metropolitan area has various school areas and juris-  
5 dictions and so on, and perhaps also particularly  
6 in the fringe areas where the Metropolitan School  
7 Board has no jurisdiction, there may be some need to  
8 tie together more closely the policies in the northern  
9 outskirts of the planning area to ensure that they have  
10 equal opportunity.

11 We are most concerned in the section  
12 dealing with official plan and zoning bylaw standards  
13 with the widely different regulations in the official  
14 plan and zoning bylaw categories within the Metro-  
15 politan area. We think this is quite unnecessary  
16 in an area which is supposedly working towards a  
17 common goal in planning. It is acknowledged that  
18 there must be variations in specific rules for specific  
19 projects, but there should certainly be a yardstick  
20 by which projects are measured in terms of policies  
21 clearly defined perhaps in the district plans and  
22 sets of subdivision regulations and so on so that  
23 everybody knows what the rules are, and they are not  
24 changed in midstream by one council, and in any event  
25 different from almost every council in the area.

26 In the preparation of many of the official  
27 plans, revisions and amendments to them, and zoning  
28 bylaws in the Metro area, the constituent municipali-  
29 ties, many of them, are extremely limited in the  
30 staff they have available or the funds they have





1 available with which to carry out adequate research  
2 to find a solution to a problem. This results in  
3 fact in often comparatively superficial work being  
4 done. We think the techniques in the planning field  
5 are changing so rapidly that a central agency is  
6 best suited to the task of investigating the problems  
7 which are common throughout the whole or most of the  
8 area for providing background data for use in the  
9 area and formulating plans and policies for the total  
10 area.

11 Continued diversification of effort we  
12 feel is an unnecessary drain on the comparatively  
13 limited professional resources. In this respect,  
14 sir, it may not be undesirable if there is amalgamation  
15 to have district offices. I am not suggesting that  
16 everybody should work in one giant building. I think  
17 it would be essential to have some district offices  
18 because there are local planning problems which  
19 should be dealt with or could more easily be dealt  
20 with with staffs on the spot, but this is a detailed  
21 part of the administration of Metropolitan planning.

22 For instance, a great deal of money is  
23 being spent on data banks, but the City of Toronto  
24 and the York Township data banks, in the planning  
25 field, have not been coordinated so that there may  
26 be -- we don't know -- an overlap in the information  
27 that they are collecting, and there may be diversifi-  
28 cation that the two could not be easily joined to-  
29 gether. This and many other problems have appeared  
30 in the recent past.







1           The whole question of zoning bylaw density  
2 standards is an extremely difficult one. There is a  
3 case in the not too distant past where two municipali-  
4 ties were in front of the provincial body, the Ontario  
5 Municipal Board, for the approval of amendments to the  
6 zoning bylaw, both suggesting their maximum density  
7 on either side of the same road; the maximum density  
8 varied by almost 75 per cent, so what standards does  
9 one apply in approving this? Particularly when there  
10 is opposition and people say "That is too high," and  
11 yet on the other side of the road where the density  
12 is almost twice as high, if there was no opposition  
13 would that be all right?

14           This is a ticklish and difficult problem  
15 that is not uncommon. We have mentioned in for-  
16 mulating district plans and so on there may be a good  
17 deal of problem in getting existing municipalities  
18 to agree to the district plans, particularly where  
19 one municipality is suggesting a very high density  
20 in order to appeal to developers in order to get re-  
21 development, and they are given a bonus in terms of  
22 very high density. Whether this is good or bad,  
23 the difference between it and the adjacent municipality  
24 may have serious consequences.

25           Last, sir, we would turn to the extent of  
26 the Metropolitan planning area. We have suggested  
27 or discussed this question of representation on the  
28 Metro Planning Board and the problems that are occasion-  
29 ed by the adoption of the Metropolitan Official Plan  
30 which concerns not only the Metropolitan Municipality





1 but areas outside.

2 In the past, control of the planning area  
3 which is being done I wouldn't say on an ad hoc basis,  
4 which would probably be intensified as a result of  
5 adoption of a plan. The very constraints that have  
6 been exercised and kept comparatively orderly  
7 development within the Metropolitan planning area  
8 have made land outside the Metropolitan planning area  
9 very attractive to developers whose customers are in  
10 fact fully part of the Metropolitan complex. The  
11 most significant example of this phenomenon is the  
12 Brampton-Bramalea complex.

13 Now, it has long been suggested that the  
14 province should be concerned with the extent and  
15 ramifications of growth in the several urban centred  
16 regions in Ontario, the largest of which is Toronto.  
17 Its hesitancy in this matter has been excused on the  
18 grounds that local autonomy was preferable and that  
19 provincial interference was undesirable. Whatever the  
20 solution may be in other areas, we are satisfied that  
21 the efforts of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board  
22 and Council to bring some order into the development of  
23 its region are and will be substantially dissipated  
24 unless its influence, or that of a complementary and  
25 closely co-ordinated planning authority extends beyond  
26 the present planning area boundary.

27 I am inclined to the view they should  
28 be provincial rather than Metro because while Metro  
29 might be expanded now, in another twenty years perhaps  
30 it has to go on and on and on, whereas the province is







1 constituted to exercise this. It is constituted to  
2 exercise this sort of control. It does in fact now  
3 in many respects in terms of approval of subdivisions  
4 and Ontario Water Resources approval of sewers and so  
5 on, and this is the logical body to co-ordinate the  
6 efforts but it must be on a much more seriously co-  
7 ordinated vein, and it should again we feel be  
8 visible to the public. We should know what the  
9 province's views are on all these matters which are  
10 in fact set out in the Metropolitan Plan.

11 They would be on different terms because  
12 on a regional basis one cannot include as much detail  
13 as the Metropolitan Official Plan has, and certainly  
14 not as much detail as one would expect in district  
15 plans. Bearing this in mind we think the framework  
16 for Metropolitan authority can much more easily be  
17 provided by the coordinating body of the province which  
18 exists now than by most others, although there may be  
19 other solutions.

20 In fact, we are talking about the province  
21 doing some regional planning and implementing it. There  
22 may be good reason for talking about county planning  
23 or joint county planning, but I think essentially the  
24 coordination has to be done because there is going  
25 to continue to be disunity unless there is drastic  
26 revision of the taxation structure whether they are  
27 a local municipality or anything else doing the work;  
28 there is bound to be some competition, and the only  
29 body on which there is representation of the people is  
30 the province, and that has the prime responsibility,







1 their prime responsibility, we feel in planning terms.

2 Lastly, sir, we would like to briefly draw  
3 your attention to the problems of cottage and resort  
4 areas. A considerable amount of money has been  
5 allocated by the province for the acquisition of lake-  
6 shore land on Lake Ontario for recreational facilities,  
7 but we are satisfied that in the future a tremendous  
8 amount of land will be wanted by the residents of the  
9 Metropolitan area for recreational facilities in the  
10 northern parts of the province, Muskoka and beyond, and  
11 since it might be impossible -- well, it is impossible  
12 -- from a legislative point of view for Metro to have  
13 any jurisdiction over these areas and try and keep  
14 areas open, it is certainly possible that the province  
15 should look into this problem as indeed the federal  
16 government in the U.S. did in its massive 27-volume  
17 report on outdoor recreational facilities. We think  
18 something of this nature is urgently called for on a  
19 provincial level so that the Metropolitan population  
20 has a chance to enjoy the benefits in the area and  
21 they are not entirely sealed off by private develop-  
22 ment.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not suggesting  
24 that the report should necessarily consist of 27  
25 volumes?

26 MR. BACON: Not necessarily. They have  
27 a rather larger population. But there are about four  
28 of those volumes which are pretty hefty which contain  
29 really the meat of the recommendations. The rest are  
30 dealing with specific regional areas, sir, but I think





1 this sort of thing really points to the need for a  
2 complete re-analysis of our recreational standards,  
3 and I think many municipalities are now geared to  
4 using proposed standards of the National Association,  
5 Recreational Association of the United States. This  
6 report by the President's Committee suggests that  
7 perhaps standards just are not valid now. They  
8 were valid when people didn't travel one hundred  
9 miles to a lake area, but where society is quite  
10 prepared to do this, then some of the "ten acres  
11 per thousand" and so on might well be provided one  
12 hundred miles away, and one has to completely reevaluate  
13 our whole recreational standard.

14 In conclusion, Mr. Commissioner, I would  
15 like if I may just to read the recommendations. We  
16 have, in this brief, made observations in respect to  
17 a number of factors of planning significance. The  
18 chapter does not insist that amalgamation is the only  
19 solution within the present Metropolitan area, although  
20 it seems to be an eminently satisfactory way to solve  
21 most problems. We do, however, respectfully recom-  
22 mend that whatever method of solving the present  
23 dilemma is chosen, the following should be considered:

24 (a) That the financial resources of the  
25 constituent municipalities now in the Metro-  
26 politan municipality be centralized and  
27 allocated on a per capita or other suitable  
28 basis in accordance with local need.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: What does that mean?

30 MR. BACON: That education, housing,







1 transportation, other problems, and there are many  
2 other problems, but these are instances we have  
3 mentioned in some detail in this brief -- it should  
4 be possible for public housing, for instance, to be  
5 put in Etobicoke without them really feeling hard done  
6 by in financial terms.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I am asking you more specifi-  
8 cally what you mean when you say that the financial  
9 resources be centralized and allocated on a per capita  
10 or other suitable basis in accordance with local needs.  
11 Are you suggesting that the Metropolitan Corporation  
12 should become solely responsible for levying and  
13 collecting taxes and paying them out to the local  
14 municipalities on a per capita or other basis?

15 MR. BACON: If amalgamation does not take  
16 place, yes, sir, I think this is a suitable method.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: You think it would be  
18 sound for the Metropolitan Corporation to collect all  
19 the money and then hand it out to the local municipali-  
20 ties to spend it without any responsibility for raising  
21 some of the money themselves? Perhaps that is a  
22 question I should put to political scientists rather  
23 than to planners.

24 MR. BACON: Probably, yes, sir, but I  
25 would be inclined to take a stab at saying yes, because  
26 we have many examples where money is not raised by the  
27 body that is responsible for spending it. For instance,  
28 at least 50 per cent of our budget for schools.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but I specifically  
30 asked you a question whether you would make Metro





1 the sole body to levy and collect taxes and pay out  
2 the proceeds to the municipalities?

3           There is a difference between one body  
4 collecting all the money and paying it out and one  
5 body collecting part of the money and paying that out,  
6 leaving the local municipalities responsible for  
7 raising some of the money on their own.

8  
9  
10 --

11  
12  
13  
14 --

15  
16  
17  
18 --

19  
20  
21 --

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 MR. BACON: I think I would be inclined  
2 to say that since if one assumes that a Metropolitan  
3 Official Plan will touch (and I feel that it should) on  
4 almost every area on which public funds are spent and  
5 that most of these to be fairly allocated should be  
6 on a Metropolitan rather than a strictly municipal  
7 basis, it would be best if all the funds were con-  
8 nected and distributed by the Metropolitan Corpora-  
9 tion, upon which of course there are representatives --  
10 and perhaps these should be different. We make no  
11 submission in this regard, but perhaps these should  
12 be differently allocated so at least they would be  
13 representative of each municipality.

14 The second recommendation that we make,  
15 sir, is that the requirement that the Toronto Transit  
16 Commission be self-supporting be removed from the Act.  
17 Thirdly we recommend that uniform zoning standards  
18 and regulation be instituted at least over the entire  
19 Metropolitan Municipality, and preferably over the  
20 entire planning area.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say "uniform  
22 zoning standards" do you mean a uniform zoning bylaw  
23 for the Metropolitan Municipality or that there should  
24 be certain standards which could be varied in certain  
25 ways by the local municipalities?

26 MR. BACON: This gets into a large subject,  
27 sir, but to be as concise as I possibly can, I think  
28 basically if anybody looks at the symbol R2 on a map  
29 anywhere in the Metropolitan area it should mean the  
30 same thing.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: That is holding?

2 MR. BACON: Well, it is used as holding,  
3 sir; it is generally and I think quite wrongly in  
4 many municipalities. This in fact was brought out  
5 with some force in the report.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you do not have  
7 to develop that.

8 MR. BACON: R2 should mean the same thing.  
9 If it is holding, well then it should mean holding  
10 throughout the area. RM6 should mean the same thing.  
11 Also standards in respect to the maximum floor space  
12 index should mean the same thing in similar areas.

13 It seems obvious, certainly in different  
14 parts of the area -- well, not obvious, but I think  
15 there is a very good case for allowing a higher density  
16 of development within a central area than there is  
17 way out on the fringes, but there seems a curious con-  
18 flict where the problem I suggested before exists,  
19 where on either side of the same street the density  
20 may be almost double. This is the first thing.

21 In the same way that the Act allows a  
22 committee of adjustment to give minor variances --  
23 and this is because it is impossible to legislate in  
24 a zoning bylaw for all the conditions that may be en-  
25 countered -- there are therefore going to be substantial  
26 differences in the on-the-ground application of any  
27 uniform standards, which I feel there should be through-  
28 out the Metropolitan area. It might be on the Scar-  
29 borough basis, which allows a sort of selection of  
30 different standards for front outside yards and





1 so on and densities to fit the particular site. It  
2 might be on another basis.

3 As long as there is not development control  
4 in the British terms or Alberta terms which gives a  
5 considerable amount of flexibility to the administrator  
6 of a bylaw, the civil servant in the name of the  
7 municipality, I think the Committee of Adjustment  
8 or some other body like this is bound to have a  
9 major influence. But at least the standard within  
10 which it is working should be very much more clearly  
11 spelled out and be uniform throughout the area and  
12 the same thing certainly should apply in terms of  
13 building bylaws.

14 Fourthly, we recommend that legislation  
15 require the implementation of a Metropolitan Official  
16 Plan <sup>the adoption of</sup> by/district plans and subsequently zoning  
17 bylaws within two to three years of the adoption of  
18 a Metropolitan Official Plan. Fifthly we recommend  
19 that building bylaws, engineering design standards  
20 and specifications be made uniform over the entire  
21 Metropolitan municipal area -- and preferably within  
22 the planning area.

23 Next we recommend that either the boundaries  
24 of the Metropolitan planning area be extended to in-  
25 clude all land within the influence of the Metropolitan  
26 agglomeration, or that the province undertake to  
27 ensure the proper control of development beyond the  
28 Metropolitan planning area. Whatever action is taken  
29 in respect to the extent of the Metropolitan planning  
30 area the province should assume the responsibility







1 for making and implementing regional planning in the  
2 area outside the Metropolitan planning area.

3 Again whatever action is taken in respect  
4 to the boundaries of the Metro planning area legislation  
5 should require the positive implementation of an  
6 official plan for Metropolitan Toronto -- a big plan.  
7 Lastly we recommend that the recreational needs of  
8 the Metropolitan Toronto complex be recognized by  
9 and responsibility for their study, control and pro-  
10 vision be assumed by the Province.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
12 Mr. Bacon.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE  
ONTARIO DIVISION

---

Appearances:

Mr. A. R. Grant	President
Mr. A. Scott	Past President
Mr. J. Bousfield	Planning Consultant

---

MR. GRANT: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

I would like to introduce myself and my colleagues who are here. My name is Grant and I am the President of the Urban Development Institute, Ontario Division. This Institute is an association of land developers, consulting engineers, town planners and architects in the Province of Ontario.

With me this morning I have Mr. Allan Scott, who is our immediate Past President and Mr. John Bousfield, an associate member of the Institute whose committee was largely responsible for the compilation of the brief. I would like to call on Mr. Bousfield to present the brief to you. Thank you.

MR. BOUSFIELD: Mr. Commissioner, the aims of the Institute are set out on the first page of the brief.

THE COMMISSIONER: I would just like you to highlight it because I have read your brief.

MR. BOUSFIELD: Very good; so you know basically the Institute's aim. You are aware too, and





1 I am sure that evidence has come before you on the  
2 rate of growth in the Metropolitan area that has taken  
3 place in the past decade. It is obvious to you, I  
4 am sure, that this could not have taken place without  
5 the development industry and public working in concert  
6 and for that reason it is axiomatic that the structure  
7 of local government is of great importance to the  
8 development industry.

9 My submission to you this morning is on  
10 three aspects of local government as they affect the  
11 development industry. They are the multiplicity of  
12 jurisdictions that are current, the financial imbalance  
13 within some of the local jurisdictions and the financial  
14 inequalities between them; finally the urban-rural  
15 division in the municipalities outside Metropolitan  
16 Toronto.

17 Turning first to the multiplicity of  
18 jurisdictions, the problem is not a vertical problem  
19 for the developer. The existence of the third level  
20 of government -- Metropolitan Toronto -- is not really  
21 a significant problem to the developer today. As we  
22 say, things process reasonably smoothly and I think  
23 quickly through the Metropolitan departments. Their  
24 standards are well known and the channels of communi-  
25 cation are pretty well established.

26 The Metropolitan Corporation too is very  
27 metropolitan and regional minded now, I think it is  
28 safe to say, and the various Metropolitan departments  
29 are less and less concerned with detail, which is  
30 thus far a local function, and therefore there is not







1 the great duplication that there was perhaps in the  
2 early days of the life of the Metropolitan Corporation.

3 The chief disadvantage for the developer  
4 is the confusion that flows from the differences in  
5 the types of development controls exercised by the  
6 local municipalities and from their methods of adminis-  
7 tering them. My predecessor and colleague Mr. Bacon  
8 who was ahead of me covered a great deal of this  
9 ground.

10 Our submission to you is that there are  
11 some 16 local municipalities having official plans.  
12 I think that figure is subject to correction. But  
13 these all differ in their format, their context and  
14 their terminology. The fact that very few of them  
15 are meaningful as guides is secondary. At this  
16 point the real question is that there are so many of  
17 them all attempting to cover the same thing but doing  
18 it, or not doing it, in 16 different ways.

19 The importance to the developer, of course,  
20 is that many development applications -- for example  
21 a large subdivision -- are necessarily bound up with  
22 what is in the official plan and if it is a big  
23 application it is almost automatic that some sort of  
24 official plan amendment is involved. But the  
25 concern of the development industry with the whole  
26 hierarchy of official plans in the Metropolitan area --  
27 and Mr. Bacon indicated it will be one of our con-  
28 cerns -- is this question of what will occur when a  
29 Metropolitan Official Plan is established and  
30 Metropolitan district plans are established. Are





1 we then going to have continuing local overall plans  
2 and local district plans and local treasury plans  
3 and all that sort of thing?

4 For the developer it is alarming to say  
5 the very least -- this prospect that there will be a  
6 hierarchy of official plans. I would think that then  
7 the third level would become a vertical multiplicity  
8 of jurisdiction; would become a problem which it now  
9 is not.

10 You have also heard that all of the local  
11 municipalities, or most of them, have zoning bylaws,  
12 but these differ in almost every conceivable way. In  
13 our submission before you we have put in some examples  
14 which are hard to rationalize -- at least, they are  
15 hard for the developer to rationalize.

16 Our plea is not for a uniform zoning by-  
17 law throughout the whole area, because obviously in  
18 an area this size there are quality differences.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to ask you  
20 that question. I am glad you have clarified that.

21 MR. BOUSFIELD: No. In fact my submis-  
22 sion would be that there is room on a Metropolitan  
23 scale for an approach to zoning the way the Township  
24 of Scarborough has done it. Even in Scarborough  
25 there are sufficient differences throughout that one  
26 municipality, taking into account the pre-war  
27 development down around Fallingbrook and comparing  
28 that to the postwar development around Bendale  
29 -- obviously the same bylaw cannot apply to one or the  
30 other. What you would get would be a bylaw which







1 would try to average the two and suit neither.

2 But there should be at least some uniformity  
3 in the definitions of use so that at least the word  
4 "residential" means basically the same thing.

5 Then I think there should be some considera-  
6 tion as to some of their requirements that seem to be  
7 just historical or completely arbitrary with no real  
8 connection or reason compared to one area or another  
9 area. A very similar type residential area in  
10 Scarborough in quality and area and location, because  
11 it happens to be on the east side of Victoria Park,  
12 will have a different setback than the one in North  
13 York, and here there are no differences.

14 The same thing applies to some of the  
15 other aspects that have not been touched on, for  
16 example the engineering design standards which are  
17 the basis for the construction of utilities by develo-  
18 pers. These all vary from place to place. Pipe  
19 sizes for sanitary sewers can vary between one muni-  
20 cipality and another and the criteria that are used  
21 to calculate the size of the pipe, particularly the  
22 storm sewers, vary from municipality to municipality,  
23 notwithstanding the fact that the rainfall throughout  
24 this area is pretty uniform. There is not a great  
25 deal of difference, I would suspect, between the annual  
26 precipitation or the peak precipitation in Etobicoke  
27 as compared to Scarborough.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You have amalgamation  
29 there.

30 ---Laughter.





1 MR. BOUSFIELD: This applies to building  
2 codes too -- and this was touched on earlier -- and  
3 structural standards, control requirements. One  
4 example that was given here was that until very  
5 recently brick-veneer houses always were permissible  
6 in Scarborough but not in North York -- separated  
7 by a street.

8 Another very real problem for the developer  
9 is the differences in the procedures between municipi-  
10 palities and the way they handle their various types  
11 of development applications. Some charge fees; some  
12 do not. Some in some municipalities ---

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You want them all to  
14 charge fees; is that it?

15 MR. BOUSFIELD: It is remarkable that the  
16 two that do charge fees, one set of charges was in-  
17 stituted by Mr. Bacon and the other set of charges  
18 was introduced by me.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You have answered my  
20 question. You want uniformity?

21 MR. BOUSFIELD: However, the chief  
22 example we can give you is for example subdivision  
23 agreements are handled by the Clerk's department in  
24 Scarborough, the Planning Department in North York,  
25 and in North York they check all the building permits  
26 for apartment buildings but in Scarborough they do not  
27 do that; they are all done in the building department.

28 The difficulty for the developer is that if  
29 he wants to transfer or shift his operation from one  
30 municipality to another he has to learn a whole new





1 set of rules and procedures even to conduct his  
2 business. It is our submission that inasmuch as it  
3 is basically one single market the developer should  
4 be free to shift from place to place. He is free,  
5 but he should be able to do so easily.

6 There is no consistency between municipali-  
7 ties in the conditions which are attached to sub-  
8 divisions -- and they are detailed in an appendix  
9 to our brief. You are aware, Mr. Commissioner, of  
10 course, that in the Metropolitan area generally and  
11 as it is across Ontario (but it has been developed  
12 to a refined degree in Metropolitan Toronto) no  
13 development takes place without conditions being  
14 attached, which conditions usually pertain to the  
15 construction of the utilities necessary to service  
16 the scheme. Yet the requirements for services can  
17 and do vary widely even on such neutral ground as  
18 sewer levies -- which have at least a blanket  
19 Metropolitan aspect to them. The Metropolitan sewer  
20 levy is shown on Appendix C. It is uniform throughout  
21 the Metropolitan area.

22 But Etobicoke for instance elects to charge  
23 no levy of its own. North York charges a levy which  
24 is identical to the Metro levy and Scarborough Township  
25 charges a levy, but it is its own levy and it varies  
26 from watershed to watershed, although one of the  
27 watersheds is pretty well built up now so it does  
28 not feature much in development today.

29 The net effect is shown in Appendices  
30 B1, B2 and B3. You could say that there is a distinct







1 difference in each of the categories and in the totals  
2 as to the costs that are levied against development.  
3 These costs are increasing -- but that is a point I  
4 will come to a little later.

5 Local school boards vary in their stan-  
6 dards for the sizes of school sites, although I will  
7 say they do not vary greatly. In some cases six  
8 acres is big enough and in some cases it is seven  
9 or seven and a half or five -- even when the school  
10 building itself is going to be generally standard.

11 That is not a very serious problem, but  
12 it is an example of differences that do occur for  
13 reasons that are hard to justify in my opinion and  
14 in our submission.

15 The various municipalities are different  
16 in their attitude to the type and location of parks  
17 areas that they require.. It is true that generally  
18 speaking they are limited, of course, to five per  
19 cent of the area at the time, but in the location  
20 within the development or in the quality of the land  
21 that they will accept, they vary.

22 Public utilities commissions for the various  
23 municipalities have different standards as to what they  
24 will accept for a public utilities site and what they  
25 will pay for it. One municipality will pay over a  
26 thousand dollars for the site irrespective of its  
27 value. Others will not.

28 I have already given you the point that we  
29 lead to in this section, namely that despite the fact  
30 that the Metropolitan area is a single market area





1 for the development industry, it is difficult for the  
2 developer to move freely. It is a particular  
3 problem to the developer because there has to be an  
4 element of feeling, of good faith between the public  
5 body and the developer, because no matter what  
6 regulations are laid down the schemes are so com-  
7 plex that a municipality must have confidence that  
8 the developer can carry out a good project.

9 Without architectural control, without  
10 getting into that field (which is a complex field  
11 from many points of view) this confidence just must  
12 exist and because of the variations from place to  
13 place it is something that can only be built up  
14 after a long period of time. The developer therefore  
15 feels that if he has obtained this in one municipality  
16 he had just better not try to move to another muni-  
17 cipality, notwithstanding the fact that he sees a  
18 market in that municipality. He simply cannot go  
19 through it all again.

20 The second major point, Mr. Commissioner,  
21 is the question of financial imbalance, and it is not  
22 my purpose on behalf of the Institute to attempt to  
23 put before you any financial figures, which I am sure  
24 have or will come before you by persons who are  
25 competent to do so and who have studied it in detail.  
26 What I wanted to put before you is the effects of  
27 the financial imbalance on the developer and the first  
28 of these is planning by assessments.

29  
30







1                   This affects residential development  
2 almost exclusively within Metropolitan Toronto and  
3 it shows up in the servicing requirements that are  
4 levied against residential development which are very  
5 hard by comparison with an industrial subdivision  
6 which has virtually no conditions attached to it.

7                   The difficult thing for the residential  
8 developer, and this occurs most frequently in the  
9 municipalities that are most pressed financially, the  
10 standards set for residential buildings are quite  
11 arbitrary and frequently bear very little relationship  
12 to what the market is. The municipality in its search  
13 for sufficient assessment per dwelling unit to even  
14 come close to meeting school costs sets standards for  
15 house sizes and buildings and whether or not there will  
16 be carports attached, garages, and what percentage  
17 of the houses will have accessory buildings constructed.

18                  All these things are set, not by the  
19 market and demand, but set by the Planning Board in  
20 at least one municipality. That constricts the  
21 developer mightily.

22                  In municipalities outside Metropolitan  
23 Toronto which defer the advantages of the full  
24 resources for the basic facilities, there have been  
25 times when development has been at a complete halt.  
26 Development has been forced to stop until industry  
27 comes along either fortuitously or because of the  
28 efforts of the developer. The development which can  
29 take place in any one year is geared to the amount of  
30 industry that the developer brings in or which he can





1 get credit for. This has been developed to the finest  
2 art in the Brampton area, which is just outside the  
3 Metro planning area.

4 Now the difficulty with the increasing  
5 of the servicing standards is that the developer is  
6 hindered in that he cannot market as many of the types  
7 of the products he wants to. He can, as far as he  
8 is concerned, pass it on to the home buyer. Because  
9 of the practices of the Central Mortgage and Housing  
10 Corporation on lot evaluation for loan purposes, it is  
11 not always possible for the extra costs to be transferred  
12 to the mortgage, which could be paid for over a period  
13 of time like a local improvement tax. A substantial  
14 portion of the costs find their way into the down  
15 payment.

16 You have already heard this morning  
17 about the effect of that. It means that a substantial  
18 portion of the housing market cannot be served by  
19 private industry. Anything below the middle income  
20 range of approximately \$5,500.00 a year is very  
21 difficult to fit in. It is almost impossible for  
22 private industry to meet that. Outside Metropolitan  
23 Toronto perhaps that could be a little lower, \$4,500.00  
24 or \$4,800.00 income, but that is an extremely high  
25 percentage of families in Metropolitan Toronto who  
26 cannot purchase a new home.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Is this not true  
28 of almost every city in Canada and the United States?

29 MR. BOUSFIELD: Yes, it is true.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: So it is not a peculiar





1 feature of Metropolitan Toronto?

2 MR. BOUSFIELD: No. Probably in some  
3 of the smaller places houses could be purchased for  
4 less. Perhaps the medium income in the communities  
5 instead of \$5,500.00 a year could be \$4,500.00 a year.  
6 Then you will get to smaller communities like Sarnia  
7 or Sault Ste. Marie which have a very high per capita  
8 income, higher than Toronto. Then there is a distinct  
9 advantage. Housing is not the problem it is in the  
10 big cities or the less high income smaller communities.

11 I think the trend should be put to you,  
12 Mr. Commissioner. Obviously if the servicing costs  
13 increase a smaller proportion, rather than a larger  
14 proportion, of the families can purchase homes and  
15 private industry can never hope to meet or provide  
16 housing for the lower middle income range.

17 We say here, and I think it is true,  
18 that industry cannot pretend to meet the demand at the  
19 lowest income levels. That has to be, we submit, a  
20 function of government because it requires a subsidy  
21 which the private sector cannot provide. For a very  
22 large sector, which is in the lower middle income  
23 range, there is no hope now that private development  
24 could meet that.

25 It is almost as if they were too busy,  
26 it is in fact because they are too busy constructing  
27 services. What is happening, in a word, is that the  
28 traditional division between responsibilities or  
29 functions, if you like, is switching. Previously the  
30 private sector built the housing and the public sector







1 built the services. Now the private sector is building  
2 housing and the services to the project. Where the  
3 project is so high priced the municipality has to come  
4 and build the houses because the private sector is  
5 building the roads and sewers. I don't know how far  
6 that can go.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I just want to say  
8 again you are not talking of Metropolitan Toronto  
9 alone. It is a universal problem.

10 MR. BOUSFIELD: Yes, it is. I have  
11 figures here and I can put before you the evidence  
12 that the land and lot prices in Metropolitan Toronto  
13 are exceedingly high, even for a large metropolitan  
14 area.

15 The third point, Mr. Commissioner, is  
16 the matter of the urban-rural division.

17 In talking about urban-rural divisions I am quick  
18 to point out we are not concerned with any sociological  
19 aspects of it. We think there is no difference in  
20 this part of the Province in the rural element and  
21 urban element in the sense that the population is  
22 too fluid. From the point of view of structure of  
23 local government we think there is a very real  
24 difference because there is a distinct difference  
25 between the urban and rural needs for municipal services.

26 Now the problem is that the metropolitan  
27 planning area has no municipal boundaries or any  
28 combination of them adequately reflecting the line of  
29 division between urban development, either now or in  
30 the foreseeable future. As you can see from the map in





1 the corner and as you are well aware, development  
2 has spread out in, generally speaking, a V shape.  
3 It has a broad base on the Lake and of course the  
4 municipal boundaries don't reflect that. This is  
5 evident in the growth of Pickering and Toronto Township,  
6 Markham and Vaughan, and some of the smaller communities  
7 within the confines of their corporate limits.

8               Now it is our submission that Toronto  
9 Township is an urban municipality as far as the  
10 developer is concerned in that political power is  
11 passed to the urban element in that community. This  
12 is not the case in Pickering, Markham, or Vaughan.  
13 The problem for the developer is this: He is the  
14 agent of urbanization and the rural element knows  
15 so well that urbanization has costs which must be  
16 borne by the rural element, which unless they happen  
17 to be in line close enough in public services there  
18 is no direct benefit to them. As a result the  
19 developer faces an essentially negative municipality  
20 when making his application.

21               Now it is our submission that this could  
22 disappear if the urbanizing part of those municipalities,  
23 which are partly urban and partly rural, could be  
24 better separated for financial purposes.

25               Now simply to extend the boundaries of  
26 the Metropolitan government to include those portions  
27 would necessarily take in parts of those municipalities  
28 and leave parts left over. Thus if you took the  
29 Metropolitan Corporation and said: "All right, extend  
30 the boundaries to take in 1985 development line"; what







1 are we leaving over in Vaughan, Markham and Pickering?

2 Are we leaving a viable unit?

3 I am not able to say that to you. Are  
4 we leaving an area outside the realm of direct planning  
5 control which should be within the control of the  
6 Metropolitan Corporation?

7 The disadvantages of extending the  
8 corporate limits of the central government out beyond  
9 and to the outside limits of the planning area is  
10 that you necessarily include a lot of rural areas  
11 which will obviously remain rural, notwithstanding  
12 the growth to 1985.

13 This is a disadvantage of this and is  
14 evidenced by the problems of the poor farmers who  
15 live in the northeastern part of Scarborough. They  
16 are rural and going to remain rural until 1980 and  
17 they have trouble with the Metropolitan Toronto  
18 Assessment Department, as it is well known.

19 The Ontario Municipal Board met this  
20 problem in Oakville, which you may be aware took in  
21 the whole of Trafalgar Township, by creating a service  
22 area with an urban service line. They are going through  
23 this in Sault Ste. Marie right now and there is a  
24 suggestion this division could be made without the  
25 necessity of a private Bill. I am not enough of an  
26 informed authority to argue that before you.

27 I think the advantage of an urban service  
28 line is it is at least obvious and apparent to people  
29 on both sides of the line. I don't know whether or  
30 not it is more effective, but they have the feeling it is





1 because it is a more visible thing. The advantage  
2 of the urban service line, I submit, is it is a more  
3 flexible thing than a municipal boundary. It can  
4 be changed from year to year so that it can grow and  
5 extend out in the case of urban development.

6 Now the extension of the Metropolitan  
7 Corporation's limit to coincide with those of the  
8 Metropolitan planning area, the division of the urban  
9 service technique we say has distinct advantages. The  
10 first of these is that it would make it possible to  
11 achieve administrative boundaries which are coincident  
12 with desirable planning limits.

13 Although a great deal of time and talk  
14 and effort is put towards regional planning, if a  
15 regional plan is achieved that effort is only going to  
16 be partially effective unless there is regional  
17 implementation.

18 I think the best evidence of that is  
19 there were regional planning agencies in Metropolitan  
20 Toronto before Metropolitan Toronto was formed. There  
21 was Toronto and York Planning Board, the Toronto  
22 Suburban Planning Board, Regional Boards, and nothing  
23 ever happened to those plans. Then in 1953 the  
24 Metropolitan Corporation was formed as a regional  
25 administrative unit. It has still not got a regional  
26 plan but notwithstanding that it certainly has achieved  
27 a staggering amount. I think that is the most compelling  
28 evidence to put before you of the need for regional  
29 administration to go along with regional planning.

30 That is our second point that the regional





1 plan for the planning area would then be assured of  
2 implementation, through the existence of a regional  
3 administrative body.

4 The use of an urban service area would  
5 make possible a separation of urban from rural for  
6 taxation purposes and thus avoid the conflicts over  
7 needs and desires between the urban and rural elements  
8 of partially developed Townships.

9 Finally, the flexibility of the urban  
10 service line and its possibility of being closely  
11 tailored to the area of urban development, wherever  
12 that area may be from year to year.

13 I should say that the Institute does  
14 not take the position, a strong position on what the  
15 solution of the local government should be in a total  
16 sense. The Institute puts before you its problems  
17 and says whatever the solution arrived at, at least  
18 these should be an element of that solution, if the  
19 problems of the Institute and its members are to be met.

20 Control of Official Plans, zoning,  
21 building by-laws, engineering design standards and  
22 specifications, and subdivision agreement requirements should  
23 be vested in the central government, and made uniform  
24 over the whole of the Metropolitan planning area.

25 The Institute feels they should, of course,  
26 be administered locally in the sense there would be  
27 local district offices, much in the way that there are  
28 district offices now for the Metropolitan Assessment  
29 Department.

30 If a federation of municipalities







1 continues in some form, the financial resources of  
2 the local municipalities should be balanced against  
3 their needs, and the inequalities between local  
4 municipalities in this respect should be eliminated.

5 That is very easy to say.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just going to  
7 say that. You tell me how to do it.

8 MR. BOUSFIELD: My own opinion, sir, is  
9 that it cannot be done until we come to the next page...

10 The third recommendation is that  
11 boundaries of the central government be extended to  
12 include the whole of the present Metropolitan  
13 planning area and that the urban service area technique  
14 be used to divide urban from rural within that area.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: How far would you  
16 extend the spread? How big would Metro become?

17 MR. BOUSFIELD: Until there is a  
18 decision Metro should stop growing; until there is a  
19 decision on the matter by a provincial policy or a  
20 federal policy to buy a green belt, as they have done  
21 in Ottawa, and limit the development to that line. I  
22 cannot say that there should be a stop to it.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I mean how far should  
24 the Metro governmental control be extended? You are  
25 suggesting here that Metro should now be extended to  
26 include the whole of the planning area which would mean  
27 adding 13 new municipalities.

28 MR. BOUSFIELD: Yes, sir; that is central  
29 government.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Then there will be





1 further urbanization on the fringe. How big would  
2 Metro become? In due course would it not cover a  
3 very large part of the Province?

4 MR. BOUSFIELD: Oh, yes, it could.  
5 Looking along the shore of Lake Ontario we could be  
6 looking at what the East Coast of the United States  
7 is looking at, a megalopolis from Boston to Washington.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12 -

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 -

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 -

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 -







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you make the  
2 Province of Ontario subsidiary to Metro then?

3 MR. BOUSFIELD: Well, in the sense that  
4 New York State is subsidiary to New York City I  
5 suppose in many political ways it is, and in many  
6 political ways it isn't.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: There is not too much  
8 peace between the city government of New York and the  
9 government of New York State if you read the news-  
10 papers.

11 MR. BOUSFIELD: I do, sir. I know in-  
12 sufficient about the American political system and  
13 insufficient about that problem. I know that it is  
14 growing in size, but I can't really offer any con-  
15 clusions on that.

16 Mr. Commissioner, the Institute is of  
17 the opinion that for the achievement of the above  
18 mentioned recommendations it would be necessary to  
19 recognize the necessity of the amalgamation of the  
20 municipalities involved as required in our submission  
21 to create one regional city. It is easy to say to  
22 balance things and make them separate, but it is an  
23 extremely difficult thing to do.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: When you suggest  
25 amalgamation following your previous suggestion, are  
26 you suggesting the amalgamation of Metropolitan  
27 Toronto and the outside municipalities so you would  
28 have one big city which would absorb the 26 munici-  
29 palities now in existence?

30 MR. BOUSFIELD: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.





1 One regional city.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: And I suppose as  
3 urbanization spreads you would extend the boundaries?

4 MR. BOUSFIELD: Yes, extend planning  
5 boundaries first. For example, as far as we can see  
6 now -- I am sure you have before you at least that  
7 segment of the Metropolitan Toronto Official Plan  
8 which shows the anticipated extent of development by  
9 1985. With the exception of one direction boundaries  
10 of the Metropolitan planning area are adequate to take  
11 that in to 1985. They cover that problem westerly  
12 and northwesterly. Maybe up Yonge Street above  
13 Richmond Hill, but from my experience in those muni-  
14 cipalities directly north, I don't think so.

15 Now, after 1985 I don't know as we stand  
16 here today -- at least I certainly can't presume to  
17 make a suggestion beyond that date. Perhaps another  
18 consultant in another development institute will be  
19 before you.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: By 1985 there will be  
21 another Royal Commission.

22 MR. BOUSFIELD: You should say that, sir.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

24 I will adjourn for five minutes and then we will hear  
25 Mr. Comay.

26 ---Short recess.

27  
28 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Comay.

29

30







SUBMISSION OF  
E. COMAY

1  
2  
3 MR. COMAY: Mr. Commissioner, I would  
4 like to begin by emphasizing that this is a personal  
5 submission that I have prepared. Not only does it  
6 not reflect the views of the Metropolitan Planning  
7 Board, but it has not even been discussed with the  
8 members of the Board, and in fact no members of the  
9 Board have even seen this submission. The staff of  
10 the Board have been involved in preparing the sub-  
11 sion to a great extent, and much of the material has  
12 been gathered through the staff. There has been, sir,  
13 considerable discussion, but basically what this  
14 submission represents is my own personal view as to  
15 the operation of the planning machinery in the Metro-  
16 politan planning area as it has occurred over the  
17 past nine or ten years, and some personal views as  
18 to the nature of the problems that we are faced  
19 with in the future, and some suggestions as to how  
20 they might be dealt with in terms of the actual  
21 organization and operation of planning machinery.

22 I have attempted to confine myself to  
23 that specific part which I think is the only one I  
24 am really competent to deal with. However, I have  
25 had to base this discussion on an assumption that  
26 there either will or will not be a two-level system  
27 of municipal government. On the assumption that  
28 some form of Metropolitan government will continue  
29 to exist and there will also be local governments  
30 within the Metropolitan Federation, these are the







1 conclusions that I have drawn.

2 What I would like to do, Mr. Commissioner  
3 -- I appreciated the skill with which Mr. Bacon  
4 paraphrased his brief, and I would hate to try the  
5 same. I have prepared at the end of this brief some  
6 six general conclusions, and what I think I would like  
7 to do is read those conclusions and perhaps make some  
8 elaborations along the way to bring out some of the  
9 specific points that those conclusions deal with. In  
10 some cases I think I will refer back to certain  
11 sections in the body of the brief itself.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You govern your pre-  
13 sentation as you see fit.

14 MR. COMAY: What I am also intending to  
15 do, if this is agreeable to you, Mr. Commissioner, is  
16 when I conclude that particular section, to then deal  
17 with some of the statements which have been made and  
18 some of the other submissions that have been made  
19 to the Commission on the subject of the Metropolitan  
20 Planning Board, its operations and the general planning  
21 machinery; those statements which I feel are relevant  
22 to the points I am trying to make.

23 The planning machinery in the Metropolitan  
24 Planning area has operated fairly effectively over the  
25 past ten years, in the sense that the extent of urban  
26 development has been reasonably controlled to forestall  
27 sprawl, that generally adequate standards have been  
28 maintained, and that a satisfactory level of public  
29 service has been provided. This has occurred through  
30 a reasonable level of cooperation between the local





1 planning agencies, the Metropolitan Planning Board  
2 and the provincial agencies concerned. Primarily,  
3 the Department of Municipal Affairs; previous to that  
4 the Department of Planning and Development.

5 I would like at this point to divert  
6 briefly from the brief, and in the appendix I have  
7 summarized the existing planning machinery in the  
8 area, and it should be noted four of the municipalities  
9 in the planning area do not at the present time have  
10 planning boards. However, it is my conclusion,  
11 based on our work with these municipalities, that the  
12 lack of a planning board in Swansea, New Toronto and  
13 Forest Hill and Port Credit has not really had any  
14 ill effect on the control of development within these  
15 municipalities; that the local councils have in  
16 effect carried out the normal functions which a  
17 planning board would carry out in similar municipali-  
18 ties.

19 Similarly, the lack of official plans  
20 in some of these municipalities, while perhaps not  
21 looking good on paper have not really been in my  
22 opinion detrimental to the control of development.  
23 The comprehensive zoning bylaws of New Toronto and  
24 Port Credit, for example, pretty well have satisfied  
25 the function which an official plan would have satis-  
26 fied in those two municipalities. In Forest Hill  
27 and Swansea which are two other municipalities with-  
28 out an official plan, while there is no comprehensive  
29 zoning bylaw as such, the areas are completely covered  
30 by a series of restrictive bylaws, and the councils







1 have generally been able to handle development appli-  
2 cations, guide development in accordance with an  
3 overall policy which was well understood by both  
4 residents and the council itself and their officials,  
5 so that the lack of an official plan in those munici-  
6 palities does not in my opinion adversely affect the  
7 course of development.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: What do you say in  
9 answer to the submissions made to me that even where  
10 there are official plans they do not serve the purpose;  
11 that they are not adequate guide lines?

12 MR. COMAY: I think as some of the sub-  
13 missions have indicated there is a great diversity  
14 as to the content and effectiveness of local official  
15 plans in our planning area. Many of them -- in fact  
16 most of them -- are little more than comprehensive  
generalized land use by-laws.

17 I would suggest, and this is something I  
18 deal with later in my submission, but I would suggest  
19 that local official plans are not really the primary  
20 instrument by which we should be governing develop-  
21 ment and controlling development in the planning area.

22 Without attempting to quote from the two  
23 submissions we heard this morning, particularly Mr.  
24 Bacon's, I feel quite strongly that a district planning  
25 process should be initiated. It has already been  
26 started in some sectors of the planning area, and  
27 properly developed district plans within the Metro-  
28 politan plan would well serve the function that the  
29 local official plans presently serve.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: You recommend -- I am





1       sorry, I do not want to anticipate.

2               MR. COMAY:     In the fringe areas, which  
3       are now developed only to about one-quarter of their  
4       urban capacity -- I say urban capacity, and by "urban  
5       capacity" what I really refer to is the suggested  
6       limits of urban development as delineated on the  
7       proposed land use plan for the planning area which is  
8       on the wall there -- about one-quarter of the urban  
9       capacity, the success in regulating development has  
10      stemmed as much from the financial inability of the  
11      municipalities to accommodate rapid growth and the  
12      competitive disadvantages which they have experienced  
13      relative to Metropolitan Toronto as from the actual  
14      operation of the planning machinery itself.

15              The prospect of sharply increased develop-  
16      ment pressures in the fringe indicates a need to  
17      strengthen the type of control which is presently  
18      being exercised.     Primarily, in my opinion, there  
19      is a need to establish some form of unified provision  
20      of basic water and sewage disposal services; secondly,  
21      the adoption of a Metropolitan Official Plan which  
22      delineates a strict limit to the urban development  
23      area.     Also I suggest that the extension of the  
24      planning area to incorporate the Brampton-Chinguacousy  
25      development area is probably essential if fringe area  
26      development is to be regulated within the plans of  
27      an overall area development plan.

28              THE COMMISSIONER:    Would you say a little  
29      more about your suggestion that there is a need to  
30      establish some form of unified provision of basic







1 water and sewage disposal services?

2 MR. COMAY: Perhaps the best way of  
3 elaborating on that point is to suggest that while we  
4 have been successful jointly with the provincial  
5 agency which has the basic responsibility for approving  
6 or disapproving development, while we have been success-  
7 ful in controlling the rate of development within  
8 reasonable bounds so that adequate services are pro-  
9 vided and adequate standards are maintained, it is  
10 my opinion it has been primarily or very largely be-  
11 cause local municipalities have simply not been able  
12 to afford basic trunk sewer and water facilities  
13 which urban residential developments would have re-  
14 quired. To continue, what we have done is to insist  
15 and to make it stick, that no residential development  
16 can take place without adequate sewer and water ser-  
17 vices so that we have managed pretty much to forestall  
18 the type of development which took place certainly in  
19 the early years after the war, extensive areas of  
20 septic tanks, private well developments and so forth,  
21 by insisting there had to be adequate public sewers  
22 and public water supply development. It became  
23 almost impossible for many municipalities because  
24 they could not afford <sup>the</sup> systems, they could not get  
25 industrial or commercial development which could help  
26 to pay for these services.

27 What I am suggesting now is that this  
28 situation is probably going to shift quite radically  
29 in the next ten to twenty years.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Particularly with the







1 construction of north-south expressways.

2 MR. COMAY: Yes. Well, the north-south  
3 expressways are going to stimulate pressure for  
4 development. The big difference may be this: we  
5 have had Highway 400 now which is a north-south express-  
6 way for the past ten or fifteen years -- probably even  
7 more than that -- but it never came into the central  
8 part of the area. The Spadina expressway which  
9 will be completed certainly in 1968 or 1969, the  
10 Don Valley Parkway which will open up a vast area  
11 to the central area within the next three to four  
12 years, will for the first time make it possible to  
13 get into the central part of the Metropolitan area  
14 from the north with relative ease.

15 In the other direction, east-west, Toronto  
16 Township development has proceeded probably at a  
17 pace which is not unlike what took place in many parts  
18 of Metro. Transportation facilities have been there  
19 both through the province and through Metro's action  
20 of building the Gardiner Expressway, and sewage  
21 facilities could be provided because Toronto Township  
22 is right on top of the lake. To the north it simply  
23 could not provide sewage facilities except in a few  
24 places where Metro was prepared to extend its own  
25 facilities. It is going to change as transportation  
26 facilities are being provided. Construction of the  
27 CNR access line and the Toronto terminal in the Maple  
28 area is certainly according to present indications,  
29 going to open up relatively soon a very substantial  
30 and active industrial area.





1                   At the same time, the Don Valley Park-  
2 way has started to increase the pressures for indus-  
3 trial development in several sections of Markham  
4 Township, and it is quite likely that both Markham  
5 and Vaughan townships -- financial resources will  
6 become available relatively soon in the next five  
7 years for the kind of sewage facilities and water  
8 facilities which urban development requires.

9                   On that point I am not confident that the  
10 mere operation of planning machinery is going to be  
11 enough to regulate the control of development.   What  
12 I have suggested is that it is not going to be enough  
13 to suggest that Markham and Vaughan and Pickering and  
14 Toronto Townships can each programme their own basic  
15 trunk services independently of the desirable pattern  
16 of the rate of growth of the Metropolitan region; that  
17 some form of unified<sup>provision of</sup> services -- I say that frankly not  
18 knowing what I mean by "some form of unified provision"  
19 but it seems to me is very analagous to Metropolitan  
20 Toronto itself.

21                   The outstanding character of Metro was that  
22 it provided services in a unified manner, and it seems  
23 to me that the same sort of principle will have to be  
24 applied in the area that surrounds Metro Toronto if  
25 we are to continue what I think is the relatively  
26 successful pattern of development that we have ex-  
27 perienceed to date.

28                   THE COMMISSIONER:   When you use that term  
29 "unified", do you mean unified with Metro or do you  
30 mean a separate water and sewage disposal authority in







1 the fringe area?

2 MR. COMAY: Well, I am not a political  
3 scientist, but my reaction to the proliferation of  
4 authorities for these functional jobs is a very  
5 negative one. As an ex-resident and employee of  
6 the City of Chicago I am negatively impressed by the  
7 effectiveness of the results you get when you have  
8 services provided by an independent authority. It  
9 seems to me that services -- we have to face it that  
10 in fact the basic philosophy that governs our control  
11 of development of provision of services has to be  
12 an integral part of the government machinery, and it  
13 should not be diverted to some independent authority.  
14 It has to be part of the government itself.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Should it be part of  
16 the government of Vaughan and Markham or jointly part  
17 of the government of Metropolitan Toronto, Vaughan and  
18 Markham? I am citing that by way of example.

19 MR. COMAY: When I got to the end of my  
20 brief, Mr. Commissioner, I realized I have not really  
21 dealt with this one question which is what are the  
22 proper boundaries for Metropolitan Toronto, and I must  
23 confess that we didn't have the experience, we don't  
24 know. All I know is what happened over the past  
25 eight, nine or ten years, and we don't know whether  
26 it takes a central municipal administration to  
27 effectively provide unified services or whether there  
28 is some form of control which a central administration  
29 such as Metropolitan Toronto can exercise over services  
30 in the other four municipalities. I don't know that.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: There is always the  
2 possibility of an intermunicipal utility?

3 MR. COMAY: Yes. But as I understand the  
4 history of intermunicipal utility agreements in this  
5 area, they have been established primarily for physical  
6 reasons. The City of Toronto, being astride the lake  
7 is the municipality in a position to supply sewage  
8 disposal and water supply, and the Township of North  
9 York which is farther from the lake was the municipality  
10 that had to purchase these services, and intermunicipal  
11 agreements were entered into, but it was not a question  
12 of the City of Toronto regulating the provision of  
13 services by North York itself; it was a question of  
14 the City of Toronto actually supplying the services  
15 into North York.

16

17

18 -

19

20

21

22 -

23

24

25

26 -

27

28

29

30 -





1           The second recommendation is that the  
2  
3 Metropolitan Planning Board has over the years placed  
4 its greatest emphasis on its responsibilities towards  
5 the Metropolitan Corporation, and somewhat less emphasis  
6 on its responsibilities towards the formulation of an  
7 over-all area plan. This has resulted in part from the  
8 fact that most of the basic policies governing area  
9 development have already been adopted by the Metropolitan  
10 Council or the local councils in one form or another  
11 and have thus lessened the urgency to adopt an official  
12 Metropolitan plan as such.

13           Then earlier in the brief on pages 23 and 24  
14 I have listed what I consider to be the basic policy  
15 decisions that have been made over the years by the  
16 Metropolitan Corporation on the one hand and the  
17 Metropolitan Planning Board and the local planning  
18 Boards on the other, which pretty much in my opinion  
19 constitute the basic content of the development plan  
20 for the area, whether it is official in the sense that  
21 it has been approved by the Province or unofficial in  
22 that it simply represents council decisions for a period  
23 of time.

24           The matter of urgency for the adoption of a  
25 new plan has always been the result of an equivocal  
26 attitude towards local planning matters and a possible  
27 belief that adoption of a Metropolitan Official Plan  
28 to which all local actions would have to conform might  
29 serve to frustrate legitimate local objectives.

30           In this area it is important to establish







1 district planning, are you envisaging district plans  
2 within certain municipal boundaries, within the municipi-  
3 pal boundaries of the local municipalities, or is there  
4 a possibility of district plans which will cross  
5 boundaries?  
6

7 MR. COMAY: Well, we have formulated some  
8 23 planning districts for the planning area. I would  
9 say about two-thirds of them or three-quarters of them  
10 fall within existing municipal boundaries and the other  
11 quarter actually cross municipal boundaries.

12 In formulating the districts we followed a  
13 whole series of criteria, of which the most important  
14 one was probably intuition, but definitely took the  
15 position that municipal boundaries as we see them in  
16 Metro today and in the planning area cannot constitute  
17 the boundaries of planning districts.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to ask you  
19 who would exercise the local responsibility? Would it  
20 be the municipality where the district plan is within  
21 the municipal boundaries and jointly by the municipalities  
22 affected where the district plan crosses the municipal  
23 boundary?

24 MR. COMAY: I have an easy answer in one  
25 case but a hard one in the other case.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I do not know why every-  
27 body decides to leave the difficult problems to me.

28 MR. COMAY: You do not know why?

29 Our district 20 is the Yonge Street cor-  
30 ridor north of the Metropolitan boundary and I am quite





1 certain, without having given it really too much thought,  
2 that that district which includes parts of three muni-  
3 cipalities, that Vaughan Township, the Town of Richmond  
4 Hill and Markham Township -- really should constitute  
5 a single urban governmental unit. That is the easy one.  
6

7 Then again we have District 12 which con-  
8 stitutes the northeastern sector of North York Township  
9 and the northwestern sector of Scarborough Township  
10 and the boundary bisects this district almost in half,  
11 the boundary being Victoria Park Avenue. We are pretty  
12 much convinced that this is the proper district,  
13 District 12. The way we have drawn it it is basically  
14 from the Malvern area of Scarborough over to the  
15 Willowdale area of North York and is a large but viable  
16 planning district.

17 I do not know the answer because the fact  
18 is that you have a municipal boundary which bisects it  
19 and while I have carefully, as I indicated, kept away  
20 from attempting to suggest to you what are the proper  
21 boundaries of Metropolitan municipalities, I have yet  
22 to see any submission made to you which had not accepted  
23 Victoria Park as being a proper boundary.

24 The prevailing attitude of the provincial  
25 agencies in failing to acknowledge the necessity of a  
26 supervisory Metropolitan level of development control  
27 indicates that clarification of the respective roles --  
28 that is, the local, metropolitan and provincial roles  
29 -- is not attainable by procedural means but should be  
30 handled by explicit legislative assignment to the







1 Metropolitan Corporation of basic development control  
2 responsibilities. Otherwise the insertion of a new  
3 level of official plan in the present control machinery  
4 can be expected to lead to administrative confusion.  
5 The Metropolitan responsibility in development control  
6 should extend to subdivision processing, local official  
7 plans and amendments and the establishment of reasonably  
8 uniform area-wide zoning standards within which local  
9 discretion in site development control can be exercised.  
10

11 What I am trying to say here, Mr. Commissioner,  
12 is that the situation in Metro Toronto is a unique one  
13 in North America, and it was probably difficult to en-  
14 visage how you would actually operate a two-level plan-  
15 ning control system when the basic legislation was  
16 drawn. But it is quite clear that the only way that  
17 the responsible authorities and those who have the basic  
18 ultimate responsibility for controlling the development,  
19 which are the Provincial agencies, the only way they  
20 have been prepared to recognize that there is a unique  
21 situation here is through a whole series of procedural  
22 arrangements.

23 The basic principle of these procedural  
24 arrangements has been that Metro will be consulted with  
25 respect to all aspects of development control, but there  
26 has been a recognition of what I take to have been one  
27 of the objectives in the creation of Metropolitan  
28 Toronto, which is that there is another level of  
29 government being established to exercise a supervisory  
30 type of control over development.





1                   The prevailing attitude has been that  
2 the Provincial agencies must operate within the frame-  
3 work which they have been given by the legislature.  
4 The legislature has specified certain powers in the  
5 Planning Act and the various other acts which are  
6 relevant to the Provincial agencies. I can see no  
7 other way they could have done it. What I mean there  
8 is, if I were in their shoes I probably would have  
9 done it exactly the same way, although I can see a lot  
10 of other ways to do it in theory.

11                  They have taken the position that they  
12 are dealing with local municipalities and Metro does  
13 not have certain powers under the Act -- for example,  
14 subdivision control powers under the Planning Act.  
15 Therefore Metro will be consulted on subdivisions but  
16 only in that it helps the Provincial Government to  
17 make up its mind as to what to do. It has worked and  
18 it has worked well, but the fact is that the consul-  
19 tation is in my opinion extremely inadequate. The  
20 consultation consists of receiving advice from Metro  
21 and that is the end of it. From that point on the  
22 control of development is handled almost exclusively  
23 between the local municipality and the Provincial  
24 agency concerned.

25                  I really cannot say very much more than  
26 that, except that it is part of my basic theme. I do  
27 not believe that you can really exercise proper control  
28 over development with an intermediate level of govern-  
29 ment if that intermediate level of government is not  
30







1 getting certain clearly understood powers. I do not  
2 think the Metropolitan Corporation has been given  
3 these powers by the legislation and not by the pro-  
4 cedural arrangements that have been instituted.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: The Metropolitan  
6 Toronto Act, Section 220, says that the Metropolitan  
7 Corporation shall be deemed to be a municipality for  
8 the purposes of certain sections of the Planning Act  
9 and no area shall be deemed to be a municipality for  
10 the purposes of Section 7 of the Act with respect to  
11 financial requirements of the Board for the Metro-  
12 politan Toronto Planning Area.

13 Are you saying the sections of the  
14 Planning Act from which you are excluded are sections  
15 which should apply to your Board?

16 MR. COMAY: That is only part of what  
17 I am saying. The two major sections with which we are  
18 concerned are subdivision control and zoning by-laws.  
19 I think those should have been given to the Metropo-  
20 litan level of government. In fact this was one of  
21 the recommendations which was made in the original  
22 report of the Ontario Municipal Board but subsequently  
23 was not adopted in the legislation itself.

24 That is part of the answer. The other  
25 part of the answer is that because Metro is unique  
26 and its two-level structure is unique there probably  
27 should be specific provisions within the Metropolitan  
28 legislation -- not the Planning Act or the Municipal  
29 Act or any of the other Acts, but in the Metropolitan  
30







1 legislation itself -- which spell out whether Metro  
2 does or does not have supervisory types of power.

3 Perhaps I could illustrate this by  
4 going through what the process is. A municipality  
5 wishes to adopt a zoning by-law. The application is  
6 made to the Ontario Municipal Board. We, like any  
7 other interested agency, are given notice -- and the  
8 O.M.B. has directed that we be given notice of all  
9 proposed by-laws in the planning area. Incidentally,  
10 that did not come overnight either -- this direction  
11 that we be given notice. We are given notice. We may  
12 or may not advise the O.M.B. of our position on this  
13 matter.

14 What I am suggesting is that if there  
15 is a real two-level system of planning control at the  
16 municipal level our Board should be obligated to deal  
17 with every application. It should be obligated to  
18 state whether it does or does not conform to the over-  
19 all development plan -- or whatever it is that the  
20 Metropolitan municipality has adopted, still leav-  
21 ing it to the Provincial agencies concerned -- whether  
22 it is the O.M.B. or the Minister; whatever it may be  
23 -- to make the final decision as to whether the muni-  
24 cipality shall or shall not be permitted to do what  
25 it proposes to do.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: But that is not  
27 possible so long as the official plan is not adopted.  
28 You are assuming the situation if the official plan  
29 is adopted; is that not correct, Mr. Comay?  
30





1  
2 MR. COMAY: Yes, but I am also saying  
3 as strongly as I know how that there could not be an  
4 effective Metropolitan official plan unless there is  
5 a statutory provision as to how you are going to ad-  
6 minister a Metropolitan Official Plan.

7 We have taken two cracks at this, the  
8 first one weighing four pounds and the second one is  
9 a lot smaller. We think we have it boiled down to  
10 what we think as a Metropolitan Planning Staff is the  
11 proper scope of the Official Plan. We have suggested  
12 how you can administer a Metropolitan Official Plan  
13 with the least amount of difficulty and heartache and  
14 confusion and so forth.

15 I have in my case there a six-page com-  
16 munication from the Metropolitan Solicitor, whom we  
17 have asked to advise us and who very carefully goes  
18 through it point by point, one, two, three, four, five,  
19 six, seven, eight. Every proposal that we have made  
20 with respect to administration of the Metropolitan  
21 Official Plan will, in his opinion, require some sort  
22 of legislative sanction unless, he says, the local  
23 municipalities agree to adhere to this sort of admini-  
24 strative procedure.

25 I am quite convinced that if there is  
26 going to be a Metropolitan Official Plan it will have  
27 to have some sort of statutory status. It was not  
28 enough simply to say that everything must conform,  
29 because somebody has to decide what is conforming.  
30 That is the basic problem.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: But there has to be  
2 something to conform to legally and at the moment there  
3 is nothing like that.

4 MR. COMAY: That is right.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: There is no legal  
6 point of reference.

7 MR. COMAY: That is precisely a point  
8 that I have tried to make here. I can well understand  
9 Provincial agencies operating the way they do because  
10 there is no legal point of reference. They cannot  
11 really probably do more than ask for advice. All I am  
12 saying is that they could probably ask for a little  
13 more advice than they are getting.

14 With an assignment of basic development  
15 control functions to the Metropolitan Corporation,  
16 the Official Plan could well be limited to those aspects  
17 in which Provincial sanction is necessary -- principally  
18 the land use and transportation plans, the establish-  
19 ment of area-wide population targets and the staging  
20 of fringe development. It would probably be advisable  
21 for the adoption of this essential official plan to be  
22 made mandatory, as well as a requirement for the pre-  
23 paration of district plans within this over-all frame-  
24 work.

25 Now, in the body of the brief itself I  
26 have attempted to go through the philosophy of what an  
27 official plan should be. Of course the legislation,  
28 like all legislation, does not really tell you what an  
29 official plan is and probably there are as many ideas  
30





1 as to what an official plan should be, as there are  
2 people who have ideas.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: That legislation is  
4 never drafted by philosophers.

5 MR. COMAY: I am assuming legislation  
6 is drafted by people who operate on the principle that  
7 you should do the least that you can do if you want to  
8 be effective.

9 There has been, as you know -- and you  
10 have received many submissions on this subject -- a  
11 great contention that the great failure of the  
12 Metropolitan Government is the failure to adopt an  
13 official plan. It is my contention that nobody really  
14 has thought through what is the Metropolitan Official  
15 Plan; what should it be and what can and what cannot be  
16 adopted within reasonable, practical grounds.

17 Having gone onto that point and having  
18 accepted the fact which I feel quite strongly, that we  
19 have had almost everything that would go into an  
20 official plan, in effect that we have been operating  
21 with an unofficial official plan, I came to the con-  
22 clusion that the only thing that makes an official plan  
23 official is that the Province has approved it and the  
24 way it then operates is that the Province then has to  
25 approve every change to the official plan.

26 That leads us to the point of what  
27 should require Provincial sanction and what should not  
28 require Provincial sanction? As far as the Metropolitan  
29 region is concerned I am quite content that the pattern  
30







1 of major land uses, the general distribution of popu-  
2 lation, the boundary of urban development and, as in-  
3 dicated earlier, a general programme for the provision  
4 of services outside the central municipal authority,  
5 are really all that should require Provincial sanction.  
6 And in that, when I say the general distribution of  
7 land use I must, of course, include the Metro trans-  
8 portation facilities because they are part of the basic  
9 land use.

10 I think it is probably a mistake for us  
11 to load up the official plan with all sorts of tradi-  
12 tional elements. I think it is probably wrong to sug-  
13 gest that the services programmes of the municipality  
14 should be part of the official plan. I think it is  
15 necessary that they adopt the services programme, but  
16 there is no need to put it into an official plan which  
17 can then only be amended by the Province.

18 It seems to me that if there is any  
19 basis for general local autonomy in Government, the  
20 provision of services is a matter of local responsibi-  
21 lity and should not really require Provincial sanction.  
22 I also feel that if we manage to boil down the Metro  
23 Official Plan to an essential Metro Official Plan we  
24 probably have a much better chance of getting one  
25 adopted.

26 One other elaboration I would like to  
27 make on this point, as I touch on it in the body of the  
28 brief, is that under the present legislation official  
29 plans are mandatory for a municipality to engage in  
30







1 urban renewal activities. We do not have the urban  
2 renewal powers to begin with, but as I suggest later  
3 we should have urban renewal powers.  
4

5 But as long as the Planning Act requires  
6 an official plan to be pre-conditioned for engaging in  
7 re-development and urban renewal, then clearly it is  
8 one more reason why there should be a Metropolitan  
9 Official Plan because urban renewal in my opinion is  
10 certainly an increasingly important Metropolitan  
11 responsibility.

12 The prospective arrangements of lands  
13 uses in the planning area is relatively satisfactory  
14 in terms of the anticipated gross requirements of the  
15 area, but the prevalence of local housing policies  
16 which are based on financial exigencies may serve to  
17 distort the required supply of housing for the future  
18 Metropolitan population.

19 The tendency to zone out lower cost  
20 dwellings and the current profusion of high-density  
21 apartments with some 90,000 units or about a 10-year  
22 supply presently being processed throughout the area  
23 is becoming a matter of Metropolitan concern. In my  
24 opinion it is important to eliminate the tie between  
25 local municipal financial solvency and housing policy,  
26 and some form of financial accommodation, perhaps  
27 through the pooling of assessment, is clearly indicated.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to ela-  
29 borate on the pooling of assessment?

30 MR. COMAY: No, sir.





1 I don't think I can tell you any more  
2 than everybody else of whom you have asked that  
3 question. I have tried to indicate that I don't think  
4 that we are suffering because of the drive for non-  
5 residential assessments. I think the basic land use  
6 pattern is a rational one and really has a limit to  
7 it that local assessment needs and I am prepared to  
8 document that from here until the end of my stay here.

9 Certainly insofar as local housing  
10 policies are concerned there is a strong indication  
11 these are covered to a large extent by the understood  
12 financial problems of the municipalities.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I have had that  
14 admitted to me at these hearings.

15 MR. COMAY: It is so clear to me it  
16 seems to be beyond dispute. If that is the case we  
17 are probably not getting the amount of housing supply  
18 we should be getting. I have some statistics Mr.  
19 Bousfield gave you and you already have them through  
20 your own research. There is clearly a shortage of  
21 housing for the lower one-half of the income distribution.  
22 We know that from the pressure for subsidies on low  
23 rental housing that we have. Based on our own  
24 studies there is a distinct shortage of low rental  
25 houses.

26 There are two problems. One is zoning  
27 policies, local zoning policies are geared to producing  
28 the highest possible taxable assessment in housing.  
29 Secondly, zoning policies on renting and subletting and  
30 things like that are again interfering with what might







1 well be a substantial supply of low rent housing.

2 I am not arguing whether municipalities  
3 should or should not change their policies, but as  
4 long as that is the case we don't have an adequate  
5 supply of housing for the lower income groups and the  
6 middle income groups. There are financial inadequacies  
7 and some form of attention should be given this.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Would not amalgamation  
9 solve that problem?

10 MR. COMAY: Automatically, I guess. With  
11 respect to the indicated need for public housing, there  
12 is little likelihood that the proposed Metropolitan  
13 programme can be achieved under the existing arrangements  
14 for producing such housing. The required sites for  
15 this programme cannot be secured with the prevailing  
16 attitude of the senior governments that such projects  
17 must receive the approval of the local municipalities.  
18 To carry out the projected programme it is probably  
19 necessary to grant the Metropolitan Corporation direct  
20 municipal powers presently available only to the local  
21 municipalities, including subdivision approval, zoning,  
22 and the right to require essential municipal services.  
23 The need for housing sites in the inner areas, as well  
24 as the increasing importance of Metropolitan partici-  
25 pation in urban renewal, indicates that Metropolitan  
26 Corporation should probably be granted the same  
27 redevelopment powers as are presently available to the  
28 local municipalities.

29 I would like to briefly elaborate on  
30 those two points. As of now the two senior governments,





1 the provincial and the federal government, will not  
2 entertain a proposal for a public housing project until  
3 they have assurance that the project will receive  
4 the approval of the local government; either that  
5 it is presently zoned for that purpose or the zoning  
6 can be obtained.

7 I am quite confident that if this is  
8 the only way you can produce public housing you will  
9 not produce it. You cannot acquire a sufficient  
10 amount of land for public housing if every housing  
11 project is subject to veto by local Council. The  
12 source of the resistance may be twofold. It may be  
13 financial and it may be pressure from nearby  
14 residents. I don't think that either can be discounted.  
15 It probably varies from situation to situation. As  
16 long as local approval is required we don't see how  
17 we are going to get enough land to build the minimum  
18 kind of housing programme that we have suggested should  
19 be built.

20 The most direct way of doing that  
21 would be to render to the Metropolitan Corporation  
22 the power to proceed with public housing; to take over  
23 this particular aspect of local control, subdivision  
24 zoning and approval for housing projects.

25 I am suggesting that the powers should  
26 be restricted to the case of public housing. They  
27 should adhere to subdivision standards and zoning  
28 standards in force in the general area and applied  
29 against comparable private developments. I am not  
30 suggesting we should be allowed to require local services







1 which are any greater than is required by the private  
2 developer.

3 I do feel that the Metropolitan Corpor-  
4 ation, with a central authority which should be  
5 responsible for producing public housing, must have  
6 some sort of way of overcoming this basic local veto  
7 on the approval of the sites.

8 As far as the machinery for producing  
9 housing is concerned, I must confess I am not sure  
10 how far your own terms of reference go, Mr. Commissioner,  
11 with respect to the administration of the National  
12 Housing Programme. We have prepared several reports  
13 and I believe they have been supplied, and we have  
14 general views as to what is probably the most suitable  
15 machinery for producing public housing.

16 Basically, of course, this Metropolitan  
17 Corporation should do a job; it should be a direct  
18 responsibility of Metropolitan government to produce  
19 housing with the roles of the two senior governments  
20 primarily one of financial contribution.

21 As far as urban renewal is concerned  
22 I feel there should be a legislative provision for  
23 Metropolitan activity in urban renewal. I have  
24 indicated in the body of the submission that many  
25 problems will crop up concerning the Metropolitan view  
26 on urban renewal. Urban renewal priorities and the  
27 proper reuse of development sites might not always  
28 accord with the view of the local municipality, and I  
29 must confess I don't know how in the end it will be  
30 resolved.







1                   There is an implication that urban  
2 renewal can be financed increasingly from Metropolitan's  
3 contribution. I don't believe in the end that is  
4 going to work. I think the Alexander Park improvement  
5 project is probably going to be as good a pilot study  
6 of whether you can carry on urban renewal with four  
7 different levels of government and with the municipal  
8 level actually having renewal powers itself. I am  
9 not prepared to predict what is going to happen in  
10 Alexander Park. I can already see from the activities  
11 to date the amount of red tape and confusion and  
12 inability to pinpoint who is responsible for what.  
13 It is already creating problems in Alexander Park. That  
14 I think will become greater as the urban renewal  
15 problem is tackled on a larger basis.

16                   THE COMMISSIONER: It is difficult to  
17 pinpoint responsibility as between the different  
18 levels of government: Federal, Provincial, Metropolitan,  
19 and local?

20                   MR. COMAY: That is right. In essence  
21 in Alexander Park the City of Toronto is negotiating  
22 an agreement with the Federal and Provincial govern-  
23 ments to carry out a clearance scheme in which the  
24 properties to be cleared are being delineated with a  
25 reasonable exactitude. At the same time on a parallel  
26 basis the City of Toronto is entering into an agreement  
27 with the Metropolitan Corporation for Metro to under-  
28 take the public housing activity in Alexander Park,  
29 which is by far the greatest bulk of what is going to  
30 take place there and Metro then bears the local cost of





1 producing the land for that public housing.

2 This is done by independent agreement  
3 between Metro and the City. We can see quite a wide  
4 divergency of views between the people as to whom they  
5 deal with on their left and and whom they deal with on  
6 their right hand. It can only lead to some kind of  
7 schizophrenia. Metropolitan objectives are not  
8 necessarily the same objectives as the Federal and  
9 Provincial governments. The poor City gets money  
10 from Metro and gets money from the Federal and  
11 Provincial governments and somehow or other has to get  
12 all the parties together.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say there  
14 would be fewer complications under amalgamation?

15 MR. COMAY: Yes. Another point which  
16 has been made under renewal I think was raised by the  
17 Township of East York, which recognizes that urban  
18 renewal in East York will have to be carried out by  
19 Metro.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I didn't hear you.

21 MR. COMAY: East York, I believe, in  
22 their submission have indicated that Metro should be  
23 participating in urban renewal within East York. They  
24 have also stated that this should be in conformity  
25 with local plans and zoning, which is a healthy  
26 position to take.

27 Again I am not sure that you can do it.  
28 When Metro gets into urban renewal it has to be on a  
29 basis of Metropolitan-wide consideration. Metropolitan  
30 reuse might not be the same as local reuse. Metro-







1 politan timing may not be the same as local timing.  
2 I think this is a field which requires considerable  
3 clarification and I think again, as in the case of  
4 development in Metro, the clarification should end  
5 up in some form of statutory formulation.

6 The design of major transportation  
7 facilities in Metropolitan Toronto is relatively well  
8 coordinated, primarily through the activities of  
9 various inter-departmental committees, but the  
10 diffusion of responsibility between the Metropolitan  
11 Corporation and the Highways Department for essential  
12 components of the expressway network undoubtedly  
13 interferes with the establishment of a properly  
14 integrated system.

15 Perhaps I should stop at that point  
16 to give some examples of what I am talking about.  
17 The Province is responsible as of now for something  
18 like 50% to 55% of the Metropolitan expressway network  
19 and for 100% of the expressway in the adjoining area  
20 outside Metro itself. We are building 50% and the  
21 Province is building 50%. Our expressways are  
22 designed as part of an overall transportation planning  
23 programme. The Metropolitan Council cannot possibly  
24 approve an expressway design which has not been  
25 considered from every aspect; the aspect of land  
26 use, community structure, transportation requirements,  
27 and so forth.

28 I think the final form that the  
29 Spadina Expressway is taking is adequate testimony  
30 to the fact that when Metro builds an expressway it is





1 not simply building an ideal engineering construction  
2 but there are costly compromises in which all the  
3 factors involved have been taken into consideration.  
4 The Spadina Expressway is going to cost considerably  
5 more in its present redrafted form than the way it  
6 was originally proposed. It is not going to look  
7 like quite the same expressway because Metro Council,  
8 being responsible to the governmental authority, had  
9 to take into consideration a wide variety of factors.  
10 What I would call planning considerations.

11                   The Highways Department, on the other  
12 hand, is responsible for building the other half  
13 of the Metropolitan Expressway system and again  
14 working within well defined terms of reference is  
15 designing and building certain types of facilities.  
16 Highway 401 is one example and the proposed recon-  
17 struction of Highway 27 is another example. These  
18 are being designed to do a certain job. The job is  
19 to move traffic according to Highways Department  
20 specifications. Highway #401 will be a high speed  
21 massive artery with a tremendous capacity for bringing  
22 cars a considerable distance. Because it is super-  
23 imposed upon a densely developed urban area, the  
24 movements on and off Highway 401 must of necessity  
25 affect all cross streets and all major arterial roads.  
26 All the interchanges have been designed by the Highways  
27 Department in order to produce the best possible  
28 functioning for Highway 401. Much of the friction  
29 presently on Highway 401, the weaving movements and  
30 so forth, have been removed from 401 and brought into







1 the local road system.

2 I am not prepared to say that this  
3 is not the only way it could be done. Perhaps this  
4 is the way it has to be done. Perhaps our technology  
5 in highway construction is such and highway design is  
6 such that you have to make one thing paramount  
7 and everything else subsidiary. In the redesign of  
8 Highway 27, for example, certain things are happening  
9 which are having quite an adverse effect on the local  
10 street system. There will be no interchange between  
11 the Queensway and Highway 27. This interchange  
12 presently exists and plays an important role for the  
13 community that it serves. Highway 27 is being  
14 redesigned with this interchange being eliminated. In  
15 my opinion it is the only possible way to redesign  
16 Highway 27 and its interchange with the Queen Elizabeth  
17 Highway.

18 I am quite content that this is the way  
19 it has to be done and that local interests, and in this  
20 case I mean Metropolitan interests, in the Queensway  
21 have to be subordinated to the proper design for  
22 Highway 27. I am not quite content that this is  
23 always universally the case. I think in the case of  
24 401 there was some unavoidable conflicts between the  
25 two major groups of agencies, each of which had a vested  
26 interest. I make the point that I don't know the  
27 answer.

28 I am suggesting that the expressway  
29 system for a modern metropolitan area cannot really be  
30 as effective as it should be and designed as properly as







1 it should be if responsibility for building and  
2 designing it rests with two different bodies.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Of course you have  
4 a Department of Highways there and the Metropolitan  
5 Council. You are not suggesting amalgamating those  
6 two?

7 MR. COMAY: I said I don't know the  
8 answer. Somebody asked me why I didn't recommend  
9 an eleventh Province.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: It was recommended  
11 in an earlier brief this morning.

12 MR. COMAY: On this question of  
13 jurisdiction similarly the local responsibility for  
14 the basic collector road system and for the control  
15 of access to the arterial road system has resulted  
16 in some serious inadequacies in various parts of the  
17 area.

18  
19  
20 -

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 -

26  
27  
28  
29  
30 -





1           The former, which is the collector road  
2     inadequacy, can be corrected by the preparation of  
3     suitable district plans, within the framework of the  
4     Metropolitan Official Plan, but for the institution  
5     of suitable access control it is probably necessary that  
6     the Metropolitan Corporation be given the power to  
7     regulate all access to Metropolitan roads.

8           Now, I am really touching there on two  
9     different points, Mr. Commissioner. I don't think  
10    I know what the answer is, but there is often a  
11    basic conflict between transportation requirements  
12    and local development objectives, and this shows  
13    up both in design of new suburban subdivisions and  
14    shows up in redesign and reconstruction of arterial  
15    roads and major roads in the built-up area.

16           The local municipality has, of course, a  
17    responsibility to formulate and achieve certain local  
18    objectives. The need to provide transportation  
19    through that area is a Metropolitan responsibility,  
20    and there are all sorts of situations that arise --  
21    probably not as many as one might expect, but I think  
22    it is going to be an increasing problem when they  
23    are simply not reconcilable. Of course, too, the  
24    way it shows up, you either do one or you do the other.  
25    Certainly our experience over the past eight or nine  
26    years has not indicated to us what the answer is to  
27    make local development objectives and overall trans-  
28    portation objectives coincide.

29           In case you are going to ask is amalgama-  
30    tion the answer to that, I would say no it is not







1 because I do not think this refers so much to govern-  
2 mental responsibility as to the fact naturally in any  
3 given local area there are certain interests and certain  
4 objectives which have no relationship to the overall  
5 transportation pattern, which of necessity has to be  
6 provided as well. It has nothing to do with who is  
7 responsible; it is just a basic conflict which we have  
8 solved in Metropolitan development. The English  
9 have a nine hundred million or billion programme to  
10 solve that problem. We haven't even got that far.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You are referring to the  
12 Buchanan Report?

13 MR. COMAY: Yes. The importance of  
14 parking in the overall transportation system indicates  
15 a need for Metropolitan control. I again feel quite  
16 strongly that legislation is inadequate, and I am not  
17 sure whether it is legislation or whether it is in-  
18 ability to secure provincial approval of certain powers.  
19 I must confess I don't really know, but I do know  
20 our control of access of new roads and reconstructed  
21 roads is very much on a hit and miss basis.

22 Some municipalities have very good results  
23 because the municipal officials concerned are extremely  
24 conscientious in securing Metropolitan advice and con-  
25 sultation before they will grant zoning permits and  
26 before they will approve development designs and site  
27 plans, and so forth. In other municipalities it is  
28 just by accident sometimes that you even hear of  
29 development proposals and redevelopment proposals.

30 I might cite as an example a proposal which





1 almost went through the Committee of Adjustments in the  
2 City of Toronto to redevelop the Davisville subway  
3 area with quite a large scale shopping centre, but it  
4 finally was turned down by the OMB because it was not  
5 felt it was within the prerogative of the Committee  
6 of Adjustments, but it could well have gone through  
7 in theory without the Metropolitan Corporation, which  
8 has the basic responsibility for Yonge Street, having  
9 the slightest influence in determining where cars will  
10 be permitted to enter Yonge Street, in what lane, and  
11 so forth, and as bad as Yonge Street is today, and  
12 it is a very difficult road most times of the day, it  
13 just would have been an incredibly difficult situation  
14 if that had been permitted to go ahead without this  
15 form of control by Metro over the access.

16 It is my contention that again procedural  
17 arrangements might have worked in many cases, but I  
18 do not really have much faith that you can achieve  
19 everything by procedural arrangements. It seems to  
20 me in so far as possible that the basic responsibility  
21 for controlling certain things-- in this case access  
22 to the major road systems -- should be stipulated and  
23 spelled out.

24 The importance of parking in the overall  
25 transportation system indicates a need for Metropolitan  
26 control over the provision, prohibition and pricing  
27 of parking facilities. This stems from a conviction  
28 that we have reached over the years that parking is  
29 part and parcel of transportation; that you cannot plan  
30 a transportation system consisting of private







1 transportation facilities or public transportation  
2 facilities without integrating into that system parking  
3 facilities and parking policies.

4 The issue can be very clearly expressed  
5 by considering the question of central area parking  
6 where we are certainly coming to the point where we  
7 will be suggesting in order to make the rapid transit  
8 system economically feasible it will be necessary to  
9 restrict central area parking or make it prohibitively  
10 expensive and provide peripheral area parking in the  
11 vicinity of the transit system in order to induce  
12 people to use the transit system. I am not sure this  
13 can be done unless there is some form of Metropolitan  
14 control on parking. A similar situation concerns  
15 the transit systems. The importance of surface  
16 transit services in assuring the success of the  
17 rapid transit system and the achievement of a balanced  
18 transportation network emphasizes the basic Metro-  
19 politan responsibility for determining transit  
20 policies. This, of course, is an issue which is  
21 coming more and more to the fore in the political  
22 arena. The part that concerns me is that it is neces-  
23 sary I think to clarify existing ambiguities in the  
24 legislation.

25 There are responsibilities assigned to  
26 the Toronto Transit Commission, and responsibilities  
27 assigned to the Metropolitan Planning Board for transit  
28 planning. Again it seems to me to be somewhat of a  
29 fortuitous circumstance whether things will work out  
30 all right or whether they won't. Certainly in the







1 case of the east-west subway there was considerable  
2 controversy as to who was really responsible for plan-  
3 ning of the transit system since both agencies have  
4 been assigned this responsibility in Bill 80, and that  
5 was officially resolved politically as all these  
6 issues must be resolved. Since that time the transit  
7 planning has been relatively harmonious. I think  
8 we are probably producing a relatively coordinated  
9 transit plan. Transit planning is well coordinated  
10 with respect to the subway system. It fits in well  
11 with our road planning and land use planning.

12 What I am suggesting is that it might be  
13 perhaps futile to hope that you can always hope for  
14 harmonious planning and coordinated planning to take  
15 place when two individual agencies are given the same  
16 powers. Maybe these powers are not the same, and  
17 certainly they were not intended to be the same under  
18 the legislation, but the legislation as it reads now  
19 is certainly ambiguous, and this sort of ambiguity  
20 should be eliminated if possible.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Does that conclude what  
22 you have to say about transportation?

23 MR. COMAY: Yes.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I am going to suggest  
25 that we adjourn until two o'clock. Is that all right?

26 MR. COMAY: Yes.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn to two  
28 o'clock and Mr. Comay will resume at that hour.

29 ---Luncheon adjournment.  
30





1 ---On resuming at 2.00 p.m.

2  
3 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you ready to  
4 continue, Mr. Comay?

5 MR. COMAY: Yes, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You had reached  
7 paragraph 5 on page 65.

8 MR. COMAY: That is right. Incidentally,  
9 if I could backtrack for one brief moment, Mr. Com-  
10 missioner, I have tried to confine myself as you know  
11 to the general question of planning administration,  
12 planning machinery and some basic planning problems  
13 such as transportation, but in the field of transpor-  
14 tation there is one other thought which I have not  
15 touched upon, and which if it has not been brought to  
16 the Commission's attention I think perhaps it should  
17 be.

18 I think there is this conflict that I spoke  
19 of earlier between local development objectives and  
20 overall transportation requirements; the same sort of  
21 conflict I think occurs also in the traffic management  
22 field. I think traffic engineering practices, for  
23 example, may tend to vary quite considerably from one  
24 municipality to another, and I am given to understand  
25 by the experts in the field, traffic engineers, that  
26 this sometimes can have quite an adverse effect in a  
27 metropolitan area if one municipality, for example,  
28 insists on a policy of four-way stop streets consistently,  
29 which another municipality does not have; that there is  
30 no way for drivers who are used to a normal type of







1 traffic environment to realize there are four-way  
2 stop streets, and vice versa. Those who are used to  
3 four-way stop streets do not realize what is going to  
4 happen when they happen to go from one municipality --  
5 I happen to be speaking specifically of Leaside which  
6 utilizes this to a considerable extent whereas many  
7 other municipalities such as North York do not utilize  
8 them.

9 It seems to me quite likely that this kind  
10 of diversity of traffic engineering policies leads to  
11 a lot of problems with respect to the movement of  
12 traffic in the area.

13 A similar type of problem which comes a  
14 little closer to home in the planning field is the  
15 policy on the provision of sidewalks. Many munici-  
16 palities, most municipalities now require sidewalks,  
17 but still many of them will only have sidewalks put  
18 in on collector roads and so forth, and this has a  
19 very distinct effect on the movement of traffic and  
20 also on the safety of pedestrians.

21 While heretofore the general conviction  
22 has been that sidewalks fall within the field of local  
23 amenities which should be primarily a matter of local  
24 jurisdiction -- that is, it is something that people  
25 either want or don't want -- they should be permitted  
26 to have them if they want them and not have them if  
27 they don't want them. It seems quite likely to me  
28 when you get to a developing metropolitan area such  
29 as we have here that a tremendous amount of interaction  
30 between areas and traffic going in all sorts of





1 directions and all kinds of trips being made from  
2 one area to another, it is somewhat doubtful if this  
3 type of local policy is a most advantageous thing.

4 I simply wanted to backtrack in the trans-  
5 portation field to give you that comment.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You say this type of  
7 local policy; you mean local jurisdiction over side-  
8 walks?

9 MR. COMAY: Well, whether the decision  
10 as to whether there should or should not be sidewalks  
11 should remain strictly a matter of local jurisdiction.  
12 It is not dissimilar to the point which I have made in  
13 my submission about zoning, and which of course has  
14 been made by some others. What is really sufficient  
15 justification for handling development standards in  
16 different ways from one section of what is basically  
17 a single area to another section, and whereas I have  
18 touched in my brief on the question of differing set-  
19 backs, for example, is it justified to have a 25-foot  
20 setback here and only 20<sup>foot</sup> setback there, and different  
21 height restrictions and so on? It would also appear  
22 to apply to the question of whether there should not  
23 be conformity of facilities such as sidewalks. Should  
24 they be provided uniformly or not provided at all?

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I just want to make sure  
26 I understand you correctly. It will be up to the  
27 local municipality to decide whether there should be  
28 a sidewalk or not?

29 MR. COMAY: That is right.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: But if it decides there







1 should be a sidewalk, they would have to conform to  
2 certain Metropolitan standards; is that what you  
3 mean?

4 MR. COMAY: No. I am suggesting, and I  
5 am raising the question if I may, the question of whether  
6 there should be sidewalks should remain a matter for  
7 local jurisdiction in an area which is as integrated  
8 as this area is; whether there should not be a uniform  
9 policy that residential areas should be developed with  
10 sidewalks because of the kind of traffic requirements  
11 that we have making it very difficult from a safety  
12 point of view, and from a traffic point of view if  
13 sidewalks are not provided. Should that remain a  
14 matter of local discretion or not? I wanted to raise  
15 that question because it is probably the sort of  
16 question which would not get raised in the ordinary  
17 course of representation being made here.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: It has been assumed  
19 by all who have presented briefs to me if anything is  
20 a local matter it is the decision as to whether there  
21 should or should not be a sidewalk.

22 MR. COMAY: I am suggesting to you even  
23 something as obvious as that may have some implications  
24 that are not that obvious.

25 To continue, Mr. Commissioner, in my next  
26 sentence I touch on the actual composition of the  
27 Metropolitan Planning Board. Because of its com-  
28 position, which is unique among planning boards in  
29 Ontario, the Metropolitan Planning Board has not  
30 succeeded in resolving the question of whether its







1 primary function is to serve as a staff agency of the  
2 Metropolitan government or to develop ideas and policies  
3 having area-wide significance independent of the exist-  
4 ing governmental machinery. In my opinion it is  
5 likely that the Board should continue to play both  
6 roles, and in particular should discharge its  
7 development control function in the light of both  
8 its Metropolitan responsibilities and the area-wide  
9 plan. To do this successfully it is necessary that  
10 the Board be representative of and fully accepted  
11 by both the area municipalities, including those in  
12 the fringe, and the Metropolitan Council as well.

13 This responsibility can be acknowledged  
14 by giving all of the local municipalities in the planning  
15 area official representation, perhaps through the  
16 chairmen of the local planning boards. At the same  
17 time liaison with the Metropolitan Council and other  
18 area-wide agencies should be maintained by membership  
19 on the Board of official council representatives --  
20 Metropolitan chairman and chairmen of standing  
21 committees -- and the chairmen of such agencies as the  
22 two Conservation Authorities, the two School Boards,  
23 the Transit Commission and the Housing Authority.

24 Now, if I can elaborate for a moment on  
25 that, sir, I have tried to indicate earlier in the  
26 body of the brief that the Board has tended to take  
27 a rather critical view of its relations with local  
28 municipalities. To be frank, the position that the  
29 Board has taken has not always been the most consistent.  
30 There have been issues which by any stretch of the





1 imagination could be considered only to be strictly  
2 local in significance into which the Board has gone  
3 in great detail. Other issues where the Board has  
4 taken the position "this is a matter of local discre-  
5 tion; we will not touch it" irrespective of the quality  
6 of decision being reached whereas a good case could have  
7 been made by the Metropolitan force and impact on that  
8 particular problem.

9 It is my conclusion that purity of repre-  
10 sentation on the Board is not really all that pure.

11 It contains representatives of the Metro-  
12 politan Council; it contains a number of agency repre-  
13 sentatives from the school boards and so forth, and it  
14 contains different representatives from the fringe, and  
15 has been maintained quite emphatically over the years  
16 whenever the issue has arisen, that the Board does  
17 not contain representatives of individual municipali-  
18 ties; that the Board is a Metropolitan Board and deals  
19 with problems from an area-wide point of view without  
20 reference to the individual local municipality.

21 As a matter of fact, I would suggest that the  
22 Board, by definition, has contained many local repre-  
23 sentatives. Automatically, for example, the Mayor of  
24 the City of Toronto is a member of the Board or his  
25 delegate. There are two members of the Metropolitan  
26 Council who are representatives of the City Council  
27 because they are chairman of standing committees.  
28 Similarly, certain of the suburban municipalities have  
29 always been represented on the Board, and what has  
30 happened in effect is that the Board has dealt with







1 local matters arising from some local municipalities,  
2 the strength and conviction with which those particular  
3 members have presented their municipalities' views have  
4 been very instrumental in determining the Board's  
5 action. Whereas other municipalities that have not  
6 been represented on the Board or less emphatically  
7 represented, have not had their particular local view  
8 listened to quite as carefully.

9 Now, certain municipalities have over the  
10 years requested direct representation on the Board --  
11 in the fringe, of course, Richmond Hill and Ajax of  
12 which the Commission is already aware. Similarly, York  
13 Township in the Metropolitan area has on several occas-  
14 ions officially requested that the Metropolitan Council  
15 appoint a resident of York Township to the Board as one  
16 of the nine citizen members, and the response from the  
17 Metropolitan Council has always been "We don't appoint  
18 members representing specific individual municipalities".

19 Conversely, several suburban municipalities  
20 -- certainly the three big suburban municipalities --  
21 have always had members who are in effect being treated  
22 as members of the Board. What I am suggesting here,  
23 it would be better to recognize this fact frankly. I  
24 think there is a need for continuity of planning  
25 between the local municipality and Metropolitan Planning  
26 Board if we are to have an effective two-level system.  
27 I don't think it is possible to talk about a Metropolitan  
28 Board sitting abstractly off in a different level in a  
29 corner dealing in area-wide problems which have to be  
30 dealt with at the same time by 26 different municipalities.





1 I have come to the conviction -- and I must say it has  
2 taken me some time to get to this point because I did  
3 not always feel that way -- I have come to the conviction  
4 that probably the suggestion that has been made on  
5 several occasions by some of the fringe municipalities  
6 is the correct one, that every municipality which falls  
7 within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Planning  
8 Board should be represented on the Board. I feel that  
9 that representation should be official, and it should  
10 represent the type of continuity in the planning process,  
11 and that is why I suggest probably the most appropriate  
12 member would be the chairman of the local planning board.

13 This, of course, raises two questions: some  
14 municipalities do not have planning boards, and in spite  
15 of what I said earlier that there is no strong reason  
16 why the four municipalities in question should have a  
17 planning board, it certainly would not hurt if they did  
18 have a planning board, and if they required this  
19 representation, well and good. However, it also  
20 raises the question, should there be a change in the  
21 structure of the Metropolitan Government which now has  
22 thirteen municipalities, and should the fringe remain  
23 the same with its thirteen, if each municipality were  
24 given one representative, then at least on paper you  
25 would tend to have an imbalance with fringe members in  
26 greater proportion than the Metro members.

27 I leave that for you to thrash out if you  
28 take the suggestion seriously.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: What happens if the  
30 Planning Board were to be replaced by planning committees?





1 MR. COMAY: In that case I suggest the  
2 Council should be represented. I think the represent-  
3 ation should be on an official level. There should be  
4 someone who represents official municipal policy.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Having mentioned that,  
6 would you care to express a view on the continuance of  
7 local planning boards or their replacement by a committee  
8 of Council as was suggested in a brief this morning?

9 MR. COMAY: Personally I have never been  
10 convinced of the effectiveness of an independent planning  
11 board. I am quite impressed on the basis of our own  
12 experience that the stronger and more direct liaison  
13 with Metropolitan Council, the more effective the work  
14 the Metropolitan Planning Board has carried out.

15 I cannot speak, Mr. Commissioner, for the  
16 local level because I have no experience in it. I am  
17 aware that there is a theory that planning boards provide  
18 a sort of buffer between councils and ratepayers in  
19 respect to local development applications, and perhaps  
20 that is a very useful function and a very necessary one.

21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30







1 I cannot speak to that at all from my  
2 experience, but at the Metro level it seems to me so  
3 clearcut that the function of the Planning Board is to  
4 assist the municipal government. There does not seem  
5 to me to be any need to interpose an additional buffer  
6 between the elected representatives and the agency it-  
7 self.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I have one more question  
9 on this paragraph. You say that the Board -- that is,  
10 the Metropolitan Planning Board -- has not succeeded  
11 in resolving the question of whether its primary func-  
12 tion is to serve as a staff agency of the Metropolitan  
13 government or to develop ideas and policies having  
14 area-wide significance. Is there anything inconsistent  
15 in a board with jurisdiction over a wide area being also  
16 a staff agency of one particular jurisdiction?

17 MR. COMAY: Well, yes and no. It worked;  
18 it has worked in Metro. On the other hand there is  
19 no doubt that there has been a fair amount of resistance  
20 and resentment on the part of some of the municipalities  
21 to feel that they are being in effect governed without  
22 representation -- also without the "benefit" of paying  
23 taxes; but this is a fact that is continually ignored.

24 You will note for example that at least  
25 two of the submissions which have been made by two  
26 fringe municipalities -- that of Richmond Hill and  
27 Pickering Township -- have both emphasized the point  
28 that they are having a land use plan imposed on them  
29 by a council of another municipality on which they have  
30 no direct representation.





1 I am never frankly too much impressed by  
2 the question of purity of relationships. I think the  
3 fact is that it has worked. Whether it would continue  
4 to work -- and this is a question I tried to raise --  
5 whether it would continue to work when the pressure  
6 is really high for development of the fringe, par-  
7 ticularly to the north of Metro, is something I do not  
8 know. All I am saying is that it should be clarified  
9 as to how deeply we get into local matters; what is  
10 our responsibility; what is the local responsibility  
11 and where do we stand vis-a-vis the province?

12 A reconstitution of the Board along the  
13 lines I have just indicated might make it difficult  
14 for the Board to serve as a vehicle for informed  
15 citizens to make their contribution to the formulation  
16 of area-wide development policies. This might perhaps  
17 be accomplished better by giving formal recognition  
18 to such bodies as the Board of Trade, the Community  
19 Planning Association and the Association of Women  
20 Electors as the mechanism for securing public partici-  
21 pation in the regional planning process.

22 Since I wrote that I am getting a little  
23 worried about it. I had a map prepared that showed  
24 where the women electors live.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You have their addresses?

26 MR. COMAY: Yes; do you want them? The  
27 officials and the active members of the Womens Electors  
28 -- who, of course, do provide a very important function  
29 in Metro Toronto -- maybe I am a purist in some re-  
30 spects, but I am not quite convinced that a body in







1 which all the active members live in Wards 3, 4 and 9  
2 of the City of Toronto should really be given some sort  
3 of official jurisdiction in the planning of the region.  
4 Perhaps if we are to take seriously the question of  
5 utilizing these semi-agencies more extensively in the  
6 planning process they should be agencies that have as  
7 broad a scope as possible. Certainly the Community  
8 Planning Association and the Board of Trade fall within  
9 that category. I am a little dubious about this map  
10 though referring to the Women Electors.

11 My last section touches on the question of  
12 the boundaries of a planning area. With the exception  
13 of the Brampton-Chinguacousy area, which I referred  
14 to earlier, there does not appear to be any strong  
15 reason for expanding the area of Metropolitan planning  
16 jurisdiction, assuming that there are adequate means  
17 of protecting and regulating the headwaters of the  
18 streams traversing the planning area. This point  
19 was raised by the Metropolitan Conservation Authority,  
20 which felt that unless the headwater areas which fall  
21 within their jurisdiction were brought into the  
22 Metropolitan planning area there was a strong possi-  
23 bility that their programme would be impeded. They  
24 may well be right, because they certainly would know  
25 better than I do whether they can carry out an effec-  
26 tive programme of conserving the soils and the water  
27 storage capacity and so forth with their present powers.  
28 But that is the only reason that I can see why there  
29 is any need to expand the planning area now. If it  
30 is really required for conservation purposes then some





1 attention might be given to that.

2 With respect to the boundaries of Metro-  
3 politan Toronto itself, it is considered that the  
4 basic problem to be resolved is that of ensuring that  
5 fringearea water and sewer services are provided on a  
6 coordinated basis and that the proposed urban develop-  
7 ment limit is maintained. Whether this can be achieved  
8 through the present Metropolitan machinery for plan-  
9 ning control or requires actual Metropolitan jurisdic-  
10 tion cannot be determined on the basis of past exper-  
11 ience.

12 On that point I do not really feel that I  
13 can say anything more. I tried to indicate earlier  
14 that when I speak of unified control and the provision  
15 of trunk sewer and water services I am not sure this  
16 really means it is to be under a central administra-  
17 tion.

18 One specific matter to be considered is  
19 the prospective need for additional regional parks  
20 on the waterfront outside the Metropolitan boundary.  
21 These may well require Metropolitan participation and  
22 it should be determined whether this is likely to  
23 occur without an adjustment of the actual boundary.

24 I could expand that a bit in this way.  
25 When the Metropolitan parks programme was first  
26 formulated back in about 1956 or 1957 we jointly with  
27 the Metropolitan Parks Department made some serious  
28 proposals to the Council that it participate in a  
29 parks programme outside of the boundaries of Metro-  
30 politan Toronto itself. Specifically we suggested







1 that Metro acquire an area referred to as the Vaughan  
2 Forest Reserve, a very large natural area north of  
3 Maple. We were also concerned that Metro participate  
4 in some form of regional park facility in the French-  
5 man's Bay area. Neither of these suggestions was  
6 received very enthusiastically on the grounds -- and  
7 they certainly had justification for it -- that the  
8 provision of parks within Metropolitan Toronto was  
9 such a big job and required such extensive financial  
10 commitments that it would not be possible for Metro  
11 to make any commitments to purchase parkland outside  
12 of Metro itself.

13 The problem has since arisen in connection  
14 with an area in Toronto Township, a unique thing with  
15 unique characteristics. I think I can expand on  
16 this by taking in the whole question of Credit Valley  
17 and Credit River watershed. As you are already aware,  
18 the bulk of the Metropolitan parks programme hinges  
19 very directly on the programme of the Metropolitan  
20 Toronto Conservation Authority, which has very effec-  
21 tively developed a technique for securing Metropolitan,  
22 local and provincial funds to acquire thousands of  
23 acres of valley lands which in turn are developed as  
24 Metropolitan parks within Metro and regional parks to  
25 the north.

26 The Credit Valley Conservation Authority  
27 has a much smaller financial base on which to operate.  
28 Nevertheless the Credit River Valley is probably of  
29 great significance from a regional park standpoint as  
30 are any of the valleys within Metro Toronto itself.







1 Even today I think this is true, and it will certainly  
2 be true ten or fifteen or twenty years from now when  
3 this will be a very large urban area stretching from,  
4 say, the Milton area to Toronto itself.

5 On top of that the Forks of the Credit  
6 have always been considered as being the major recrea-  
7 tional facility in this general region and up to now  
8 there has not been any effective way of securing the  
9 Credit Forks for public use.

10 The question should be considered as to  
11 whether anything is to be gained by a merger of the  
12 two conservation authorities, the Metropolitan Con-  
13 servation Authority and the Credit Valley Conservation  
14 Authority. As of now our planning policy, almost  
15 inevitably it seems to me, adheres to the Metropolitan  
16 Conservation Authority's programme. We cooperate  
17 strongly as to our development process and in a host  
18 of ways we lend our support to the Conservation  
19 Authority's programme, and we hope to bring about the  
20 achievement of its objectives.

21 This does not apply to the Credit Valley  
22 Conservation Authority. We have no effective way for  
23 example of imposing the Credit Valley Conservation  
24 Authority's requirements on subdivisions. We cer-  
25 tainly have no way of helping them to secure the lands  
26 involved. Perhaps it might be in order -- if not to-  
27 day, within the foreseeable future -- for the Credit  
28 Valley to be taken as a Metropolitan regional facility  
29 and somehow or other the Metropolitan financial base  
30 brought into the picture.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I put a question on  
2 that to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Conservation  
3 Authority and he did not think that there was any need  
4 for swallowing the Credit Valley Authority. He said  
5 there is a different drainage system.

6 MR. COMAY: Well, it is no different a  
7 drainage system from the Humber than is the Highland  
8 Creek or Duffin's Creek. I did not say "swallow"  
9 in any case. What I said was "assist".

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I see.

11 MR. COMAY: I think I would like to con-  
12 clude this section on boundaries by suggesting to you  
13 that there are several functional fields within which  
14 the boundary question could be viewed. One is a  
15 question of levy, a question of sanitary land fill,  
16 a question of transit and a question of housing.

17 There is no doubt in my mind that within  
18 a relatively short period of time as we measure it --  
19 certainly by 1970 or 1975 -- many of the requirements  
20 that Metro has been able to achieve, many of the things  
21 that Metro has been able to achieve within its bounda-  
22 ries will have become actually required outside  
23 the Metropolitan boundaries. There are, for example,  
24 a whole series of road connections across the Etobicoke  
25 Creek, the Queensway, Bloor Street, Burnhamthorpe  
26 and so forth which will require some form of inter-  
27 governmental operation under the present system.  
28 This was not possible apparently within Metropolitan  
29 Toronto before the formation of Metro itself.

30 The Eglinton East extension, for example,







1 apparently could not have been built across the two  
2 branches of the Don River until Metro was there to  
3 actually do the work. It could not be built through  
4 the cooperation of Scarborough, Leaside and North York.

5 Similarly the question then arises, can  
6 the Bloor Street extension or the Queensway extension  
7 be built through the cooperation of Etobicoke on the one  
8 hand and Toronto Township on the other, or does it  
9 require some form of central financial implementation  
10 to do that?

11 Similarly with respect to transit, certainly  
12 the suburban transit operations of the TTC, which now  
13 extend perhaps into about two-thirds of the developed  
14 suburban area on a fairly satisfactory basis --  
15 certainly we can envisage the requirement that they  
16 be extended beyond the boundaries of Metropolitan  
17 Toronto.

18 As of now they can only be maintained on a  
19 cost basis. The TTC provides services for the Richmond  
20 Hill area on an actual fee basis where the municipali-  
21 ties have to bear whatever loss is incurred. Whether  
22 this is a satisfactory method of supplying transit  
23 services into the fringe area when it becomes more  
24 directly a part of the Metropolitan urban area, I  
25 am quite uncertain.

26 With respect to housing the same thing  
27 applies. We will certainly get to the point where  
28 public housing sites will have to be selected and  
29 acquired and carried through in the fringe areas.  
30 Toronto Township is considering at present instituting





1 some public housing projects, but whether any suburban  
2 municipality, such as Toronto Township or Vaughan or  
3 Markham or Pickering Township, will ever be in a  
4 position on its own to carry out a public housing  
5 programme to fulfill part of the overall Metropolitan  
6 housing needs, is again a question I think that should  
7 be raised.

8 I have already touched earlier on the  
9 regional park question.

10 These are all factors that I think might  
11 well merit consideration in evaluating the question  
12 of what should be the boundary of Metropolitan Toronto  
13 itself.

14 I would not feel that I would know what the  
15 answer is. Whether you can do this without actually  
16 extending the area, whether some of the many proposals  
17 that have been made to you for additional boroughs --  
18 outside the Metropolitan boundary but of the same  
19 status as the Metropolitan boroughs -- I do not know,  
20 but I do feel it should be recognized that the situa-  
21 tion in the fringe is rapidly becoming analogous to  
22 that which took place within what is now Metro Toronto  
23 before Metro Toronto was formed. There will be all  
24 sorts of intermunicipal problems which are difficult  
25 problems for which some form of solution will have  
26 to be achieved.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you consider  
28 another Metropolitan set-up west of Etobicoke -- that  
29 is, from Toronto Township west?

30 MR. COMAY: It would scare me in many







1 ways. All you have to do is look at a map.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well; scare me.

3 MR. COMAY: One of our basic proposals  
4 which is going to be a difficult one to implement is  
5 that this particular section of Toronto Township should  
6 remain outside of urban development for the foreseeable  
7 future -- for the period of our plan, which is some  
8 twenty years -- because we have proposed an area here  
9 which is adequate to accommodate all of the pro-  
10 spective development quantitatively speaking for a  
11 period of 20 years, perhaps.

12 I mean, there is enough room in that  
13 coloured area for perhaps 20 per cent more development  
14 than we can reasonably anticipate will take place by  
15 1980. It is an area that can be serviced with basic  
16 water and storm sewers and road facilities relatively  
17 efficiently at a relatively practical cost. It is  
18 an area where accesses can be provided both to the  
19 waterfront recreational areas and also to open country  
20 relatively easily. Above all, it is an area where  
21 the average "journey to work" as we predict it will  
22 not be intolerable -- something of the order of 20  
23 or 35 minutes, which we consider to be reasonable.

24 That is why we feel quite strongly that  
25 this should be for the foreseeable future the limit  
26 of urban development.

27 Whether that section of Toronto Township  
28 can be maintained in rural use if Toronto Township  
29 became a little Metro with Port Credit, Brampton,  
30 Chinguacousy and so forth, seems to be very doubtful







1 because the whole question of Brampton and Chinguacousy  
2 is going to hinge on whether sanitary services and  
3 water services are to be supplied from the lake. If  
4 piped water is to be brought up from the lake and  
5 sewage effluence is to be led to the lake, I think it  
6 is going to be extremely difficult to maintain a rural  
7 area anywhere in Toronto Township.

8 That is a negative answer. What the posi-  
9 tive answer is, I do not know.

10 Mr. Commissioner, as I indicated earlier,  
11 I would like to impose on the Commission to press  
12 some points that have been raised in some of the  
13 other submissions in relation to the planning operation  
14 of Metropolitan Toronto. It seems to me, Mr. Commis-  
15 sioner, that there is a fair amount of misunderstanding  
16 as to what the Metropolitan Planning Board and the  
17 Metropolitan Board have been achieving or doing in  
18 the way of planning and I feel that certain statements  
19 have been made in some of the submissions -- particularly  
20 that of the City of Toronto -- that could well be clari-  
21 fied. At least, I would like to present what seem to  
22 me to be the facts with regard to some of the statements  
23 that have been made.

24  
25 -

26  
27  
28 -





1                   One of the principal contentions which  
2 has been made both by the City of Toronto and several  
3 of the other briefs that have been submitted, and  
4 also several studies have been done prior to the  
5 formation of your Commission, is that the Metropolitan  
6 planning operation consists of planning by assessment  
7 and that what we have been doing is providing for  
8 each municipality an assessment base, or attempting  
9 to provide an assessment base, which would enable it  
10 to achieve its own assessment balance irrespective  
11 of the overall requirements of the area. I would  
12 like to point out to the Commission that both the  
13 original draft official plan and the revised version  
14 of the proposed official plan stated quite specifically  
15 assessment considerations are not the predominant  
16 factor in determining the land use operation. The  
17 land use operation as proposed in map D has been  
18 based on what we consider to be valid and relevant  
19 planning considerations. The basic principle is  
20 that there should be dispersion of jobs and residences  
21 throughout the area; that the journey to work should  
22 be of a relatively tolerable duration and inevitably  
23 if we disperse jobs we are dispersing industrial and  
24 non-residential land.

25                   In the submission made by the City of  
26 Toronto the statement has been made on several  
27 occasions that we are producing an excess amount of  
28 industrial land and a certain number of comparisons  
29 have been made with the City of Chicago.

30                   I have here six or seven points that I







1 would like to make about the Chicago case. I am not  
2 sure whether I should burden you with this or not.  
3 The comparisons seem to us to be totally irrelevant  
4 and bear so little relationship to the actual facts  
5 as to the kind of planning going on here that I would  
6 like to get on the record the fact that the primary  
7 consideration in a land use plan has not been to  
8 provide each of the 26 municipalities, or each of  
9 the fringe municipalities with an adequate financial  
10 basis.

11 We have stated over and over again  
12 there is another form of financial condition which  
13 should be secured for financial imbalance. You have  
14 asked me what I mean and I have said pooling of  
15 assessment. I cannot go beyond that.

16 The land use planning is not a  
17 technique for providing local fiscal balance. In  
18 our plan we have steadfastly proceeded to discount  
19 land uses on the basis of adequate planning consider-  
20 ations and fiscal considerations.

21 Another point that has been made was  
22 that the Metropolitan servicing programme is an  
23 unstaged servicing programme and has proceeded on the  
24 basis of giving each of the developing townships its  
25 fair share of Metropolitan sewer and water capacity;  
26 whereas had there been a single central government  
27 the programme would have been staged and we would  
28 not have a proliferation of trunk sewers running  
29 from east to west and this would have been more  
30 efficient and more economical and so forth.





1                   The fact of the matter, as we see it,  
2 is that the servicing programme adopted by Metro at  
3 the beginning was the only kind of programme which  
4 could have satisfied the demands for housing that  
5 have occurred. The area has been growing at a rate  
6 of 50,000 persons a year with the average housing  
7 construction running something on the order of  
8 18 to 22,000. It does fluctuate, but the average  
9 is running really between 18 and 22,000 year after  
10 year. This housing could not have been provided  
11 without provision of services throughout the  
12 metropolitan area simultaneously west and east.

13                   I think it is an extremely speculative  
14 proposition to say had there been amalgamation in  
15 1953 that the amalgamated municipality would not  
16 have adopted the identical servicing programme of  
17 servicing the Humber, Black Creek, the Don, the  
18 Highland Creek area and so forth simultaneously, as  
19 was done in fact.

20                   Another point has been made that the  
21 Metro Planning Board spends time largely on projects  
22 of concern to the suburban municipalities, designed  
23 to assist their expansion, and does not devote its  
24 attention to the overall problems and particularly  
25 tends to ignore the problems of the City of Toronto.

26                   I would like to say on that to begin  
27 with the Metropolitan Corporation's programme is  
28 consciously geared to absorbing the expansion of the  
29 growth of the area and inevitably the planning programme  
30 has been designed to insure services and roads and so





1     forth will be properly developed. I think it is  
2     totally untrue to suggest that our work has been  
3     concentrated on the suburban municipalities.

4             In the submission we have made an  
5     estimate of how our time has been spent over the past  
6     four or five years. We find that over half the time  
7     has been spent on matters of strictly Metropolitan  
8     concern and work in planning assistance, for example,  
9     has occupied 15% of staff time and effort. The  
10    converse of that is that the increasing conviction  
11    and efforts on our part to engage in planning affairs  
12    in the central areas have been met by a fair amount  
13    of resistance.

14            As I indicated to you earlier it is  
15    becoming quite apparent that urban renewal is a matter  
16    of Metropolitan-wide concern. I might say this was  
17    apparent to the original Commission of Inquiry back  
18    in 1952 and 1953 which stressed the fact that urban  
19    renewal was as important as development of the outer  
20    areas.

21            Nevertheless, on the programmes which  
22    are now being developed for Metropolitan participation  
23    in rehabilitation in older areas, and the clearance  
24    of the older areas, we are not being received warmly  
25    by their people.

26            I might say as an example that while the  
27    Metropolitan urban renewal study is actively engaged  
28    in rehabilitation studies in the Alexander Park area  
29    as part of the joint City-Metro programme, the City  
30    of Toronto Planning Board has just now undertaken a







1 completely separate rehabilitation study designed to  
2 achieve exactly the same, pretty much the same  
3 objectives as the Metropolitan renewal study in which  
4 the City of Toronto is playing a part.

5           There is an analogous point which is  
6 certainly of less significance but perhaps I can  
7 make it. It illustrates the point. It is with  
8 reference to the Beaches olympic swimming pool. It  
9 was suggested that Metro was slow in coming forward  
10 to provide the pool and the City felt they had to go  
11 ahead on their own to produce this regional park  
12 facility which is being used by the residents of  
13 other municipalities. The fact of the matter, of  
14 course, is that the Beaches olympic swimming pool  
15 was a City of Toronto project from beginning to end.  
16 Not only was the Metropolitan Corporation never  
17 invited to participate in the Beaches olympic swimming  
18 pool but I would hazard a guess that had Metro  
19 suggested it wanted to provide an olympic swimming  
20 pool in the Beaches area it would have been met with  
21 considerable resistance.

22           THE COMMISSIONER: Don't you think  
23 even under an amalgamated system there would be some  
24 sort of criticism of the amalgamated Planning Board  
25 and suggestions that it was favouring one area as  
26 against another; one section as against another  
27 within the amalgamated area?

28           MR. COMAY: I think it is quite likely,  
29 yes.

30           THE COMMISSIONER: After all, local





1 interests will not be abolished.

2 MR. COMAY: No. I think you are quite  
3 right, Mr. Commissioner. The Metropolitan planning  
4 operation inevitably is going to be active here one  
5 day and active here another day. We deal with overall  
6 problems. We are going to be dealing with specific  
7 problems. We have spent quite a bit of time on the  
8 question of the Glendale sewage plan and on the  
9 processing of apartment application in the area of  
10 North York at Bathurst and Sheppard. This is a  
11 local problem.

12 You may argue here that the Metropolitan  
13 Planning Board, being paid 40% by the taxpayers of  
14 the City of Toronto and 2% by, say, the Village of  
15 Long Branch, is spending time on how to service  
16 apartments in the area of Bathurst and Sheppard.  
17 Well, tomorrow we may well be concerned, as we are  
18 today concerned, with what to do about the apartments  
19 in the area of Yonge and St. Clair; how to handle  
20 the traffic being generated by the apartments.

21 In a two level planning system, as  
22 long as one level is responsible for certain major  
23 services those services will affect local problems  
24 and those local problems have to be dealt with.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: How is the Winnipeg  
26 metropolitan system working from the standpoint of  
27 planning where they have one level?

28 MR. COMAY: I don't know how it is  
29 working.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: They have produced a







1 plan.

2 MR. COMAY: So have we.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: It was their first  
4 priority.

5 MR. COMAY: So have we. We have had  
6 a plan in effect since 1956. I think that is a good  
7 place to stop. I have nothing more to say.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I have asked you  
9 a lot of questions in the course of your very  
10 excellent presentation, Mr. Comay. I have one more  
11 question. I think you were here when reference was  
12 made to the urban service areas as provided under  
13 the Oakville legislation. Would you care to express  
14 any view on the urban service areas as helping  
15 solve the problems between the rural and urban  
16 parts of the municipality?

17 MR. COMAY: I am afraid I really don't  
18 know much about it. It sounds sensible. How well  
19 they work I don't know.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
21 Mr. Comay. I have been very interested in your  
22 presentation. I congratulate you on the form of your  
23 presentation. We will now adjourn until Tuesday next  
24 at 10:00 A.M.

25 Mr. Comay, you wanted to make some  
26 corrections in your brief?

27 MR. COMAY: Yes.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Comay wanted  
29 to make some corrections in his brief for the record  
30 and I will give him time to do so now.





1 MR. COMAY: On page 17 of the body  
2 of the brief I have cited certain examples of  
3 development applications where our Board's  
4 recommendations have not been considered favourably  
5 by the Provincial Townships concerned. These were  
6 cited as examples taken by recent years and on  
7 reviewing it I find I was wrong on one of these  
8 applications where I referred to North York  
9 Amendment 196. This is not a correct statement.  
10 The recommendation we made is not included in the  
11 former recommendation but was dealt with informally  
12 directly with the Township. We did not recommend  
13 it to the Minister.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I will delete that  
15 from your brief.

16 MR. COMAY: The Scarborough Amendment 47,  
17 some of the recommendations we made were adhered to  
18 and some were not adhered to. It is not a completely  
19 correct statement.

20 Could I also refer back to a statement  
21 I made earlier when you asked me whether amalgamation  
22 was an answer to certain problems and I suggested,  
23 I said: "Yes, it is." I did not mean to imply,  
24 as might be believed, that amalgamation is the answer.  
25 Amalgamation is simply an answer on the specific cases  
26 you refer to. I would suggest that metropolitanization  
27 of the specific services is an equally acceptable  
28 answer.

29  
30 ---THE HEARING WAS THEN ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. ON  
TUESDAY, MAY 19th, 1964.

















